DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 220 472 SP 020 967

AUTHOR Hilliard, Asa G.; Jenkins, Yolanda L.
TITLE Behavioral Criteria in Research and the Study of Racism: Performing the Jackal Function (Part II).
INSTITUTION Urban Inst. for Human Services, Inc., San Francisco, CA.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Naval Research, Washington, D.C. Organizational Effectiveness Research Program.
REPORT NO ONR-TR-1
PUB DATE Nov 79
CONTRACT N00014-77-C-0183
NOTE 116p.; For related documents, see SP 020 966-968.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adults; *Attitude Change; *Change Strategies; Experimental Groups; Group Discussion; Participant Characteristics; Race; *Racial Attitudes; *Racial Bias; *Racial Differences; *Research Design

ABSTRACT

This document describes the methodology and results of a pilot study and outlines the hypotheses and procedures of a final study to identify and measure racist behaviors and attitudes in adults. The impact of a slide presentation on racial attitudes was also examined. The context of the pilot study was a workshop on race relations designed to focus on the issue of race and to promote interracial interactions among the racially diverse participants. The structure of the workshop is outlined, and the data collection methods, consisting of two trained observers and instruments measuring cognitive, affective, social, and personal history domains, are described. Results are discussed for each of 12 measures, relating types of responses to the race of participants. The hypotheses and procedures of the final study are proposed, in which the research design calls for three groups of participants: an all black group, an all white group, and a racially mixed group. Data collection instruments and analyses are explained. Appended are pilot study workshop evaluation forms and selections from transcripts of small and large group discussions in the pilot study. (FG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED220472

BEHAVIORAL CRITERIA IN RESEARCH AND THE STUDY OF RACISM: PERFORMING THE JACKAL FUNCTION (PART II)

1 4 5 W71 16 P

The Urban Institute for Human Services, Inc.

San Francisco, California

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Asa G. Hilliard

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEHAVIORAL CRITERIA IN RESEARCH AND THE STUDY OF RACISM: PERFORMING THE JACKAL FUNCTION (Part II)

Asa G. Hilliard
Yolanda L. Jenkins

The Urban Institute for Human Services, Inc.
1330 Gough Street
San Francisco, California 94109

ONR Technical Report 1
Part II
November 1979

This research was sponsored by the Organizational Effectiveness Research Program, Office of Naval Research (Code 452), Washington, D.C., under Contract #N00014-77-C-0183

Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for any purpose of the United States Government.

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION - "Here are the Trees, but Where is the Forest?" A Need for Theory in Race Relations Research	1
	Objectives of the Pilot Study	4
II.	THE PLANNING PHASE	5
	Selection of the Research Instruments	5
	Training of Observers	7
	Selection of the Research Site	7
	Selection of Participants	8
III.	THE PILOT STUDY	9
	Theoretical Rationale for the Workshop Format	9
	The Agenda	10
	General Assumptions	10
	Description, Assumption and Purpose of the Workshop's Research Instruments	11
IV.	WORKSHOP	15
V.	RESULTS	18
	Background Information Data	18
	Attitude Survey I (Pre-Test)	22
	Behavior Scores System	24
	Sociometric Seating Patterns	27
	Group Process Report Data	28
	Social Interaction Sequence Analysis	31
	Historical Facts Quiz	34
	Design of the Test	34

Page

Results of Historical Facts Quiz 38

Question 1 Results 38

Question 2 Results 45

Results of Large Group Discussion 52

Results from Coding Scheme #1 (Degree of Identification) 55

Results from Coding Scheme #2 (Degree of Legitimation) 58

Description of Large Group Discussion Trends 60

VI. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY 62

Assumptions of the Study 62

Hypotheses 63

Procedures 66

Design 66

Selection of Subjects 67

Instrumentation 67

Background Information Sheet 67

Attitude Scale 67

Historical Facts Quiz 68

Evaluation Form 68

Data Collection 68

Data Analysis 72

References 73

Appendices 74

Evaluation Forms 75

Small Group Task 91

Large Group Discussion 101

I. Introduction

"Here are the Trees, but Where is the Forest?"

A Need for Theory in Race Relations Research

Social research is both an art and a science. The exploration of human behavior requires the synthesis of artistic sensitivity and scientific rigor. However, over time, the research community has developed its own set of cultural norms that reveres the precision of scientific logic at the expense of conceptual creativity.

> Instead of being creative, inspired artists-scientists, we are tending to become (and to breed) "commercial technicians" who apply energy and resources to the production of products (publications and renewed grants) rather than to the production of stimulating ideas.
>
> In many ways, the cultures of which we are part (the university and the larger professional community) foster a set of values and norms that seem to lead toward a tendency to commercialize our research . . . more and more focus has been placed on procedures, and less on substance. The dual nature of science seems at present to be greatly out of balance, elevating rigor of procedures to the detriment of creativity of substantive ideas. This lack of balance is both good and bad -- good for the obvious reason that our armamentarium for dealing with ideas is steadily growing, but bad in the sense that it increases ideational sterility.
>
> (McGrath and Altman; 1966, pp. 86-87).

This imbalance is evident in race relations studies and small group research where the emphasis is on the rigor of statistical methodologies rather than on theoretical formulations. There is a plethora of empirical research studies in both race relations and small group behavior that have been implemented without integrating conceptual frameworks. The need for theory has been clearly documented. "The greatest need in the small group research field is for more and better theory. By theory, here, the authors simply mean systematic attempts to formulate sets of principles, postulates, and hypotheses about relationships among the variables of the field which can then be tested empirically" (McGrath and Altman, 1966, pp. 76-77).

In order to avoid some of the research pitfalls cited, the staff at the Urban Institute for Human Services, Inc. expended considerable energy reviewing the literature and research on race, race relations and small group behavior in order to develop a conceptual model to guide our research. The results of our efforts is the integration of some elements and perspectives from two theoretical notions: 1) legitimation theory; and 2) balance theory (based on the work of Fritz Heider). Heider's balance theory provides a formula for predicting racially legitimizing/delegitimizing behaviors or acts.

On the macro-level, one of our theoretical assumptions is that there are institutionalized and socio-cultural mechanisms operating within the social system which legicimize and maintain racist behavior, i.e., behaviors which bestow privileges on one group while denying privileges for others based on skin color differences. As an example,

the United States government espouses Affirmative Action for its "minority" members but releases unemployment figures which indicate that unemployment is lowest for white males and highest for Blacks, Black males, in particular. Yet, this apparent incongruity in ideology and practice is legitimized (rationalized) and societally balanced as this trend remains constant and consistent.

On the micro-level, one theoretical assumption is that the individual will engage in socially-sanctioned and legitimized behaviors which express his racist beliefs. Based on our theoretical assumptions, the primary goal of this research project is to identify behaviors and conditions for varieties of behavioral expression of racial legitimation or delegitimation.

The two principal research questions asked were:

1) What are behavioral indicators of racial legitimation and delegitimation?

2) Do these behavioral indicators change when a stimulus is introduced that legitimizes a socially-delegitimized group (in this case Afro-Americans)?

Does this stimulus upset the psychological balance of racial privilege and legitimation? A detailed explication of the conceptual model was presented in Technical Report I, Development of a Methodology.

After the formulation of the conceptual model, the project's next major hurdle was the specification of a methodology. The pragmatics of operationalizing a concept often preclude the total illumination of the concept's abstract clarity. Limitations increase as the complexity of the design increases. A study of behaviors in a group setting is a complex design.

> there is . . . a need for use of data collection and analysis methods that fit the complex, multivariate nature of the phenomena of the small group field. Nearly all would subscribe to the statement that small groups represent complex systems influenced by a multiplex of interdependent variables. But like our belief in programmatic study, our premise of interdependence of multiple variables is usually ignored in the practice of small group research. Most studies of small groups deal with a highly restricted set of variables and relate them to each other two at a time (McGrath and Altman, 1966, p. 71).

In order to capture as many diverse aspects of the research task as possible, we selected a multitrait, multimethod approach. Data were collected on two levels of analysis; the individual level and the member-group level. On the individual level, data was collected on biographical characteristics racial attitudes, and historical knowledge. On the member-group level, information was gathered on group characteristics, group roles, sociometric choices, and social interaction patterns, outcomes, and content. The methods used were self-reports, systematic observations, and taped transcriptions. A detailed explanation of the instruments and methods used is given in Chapter 3.

Objectives of the Pilot Study

The first year of the ONR project was spent in the design and implementation of the pilot study. The specific objectives of the pilot study were:

1) to test the validity of the conceptual model
2) to refine the conceptual model

3) to pilot test research instruments to determine their appropriateness for measuring behavioral expressions of racism.

4) to employ strategies that would elicit racially-specific behaviors.

5) to identify behavioral indicators of racism

6) to specify configurations of racial legitimizing and delegitimizing behaviors (behavioral criteria) and the conditions under which they occur

7) to measure the impact of the slide presentation "Return to the Source" by behavioral and attitudinal change.

II. THE PLANNING PHASE

A. Selection of the Research Instruments

Since our theoretical model states that there are multi-variables impacting upon a given situation which must be taken into account, a variety of research instruments were selected for inclusion in the pilot study to provide breadth in terms of multiple approaches and depth in terms of data yield relevant to the study's research objectives. The research instruments consisted of both traditional, valid, reliable measures and new, instruments specifically created for the ONR research study.

The instruments were selected to measure the three domains of behavioral assessment identified by our conceptual model of racial legitimation: 1) the cognitive domain -- how an individual processes information; 2) the affective -- how a person feels or what attitudes

a person has toward someone(s) or something(s); and 3) the social -- how a person acts toward or interacts with others. There is also a fourth domain which we call the personal history domain, which describes the person in terms of his/her position in the social structure and his/her previous racial contacts and experiences.

The following are the research instruments used to record behavior in each of the four domains:

1) The Cognitive Domain

- The Historical Facts Quiz, pre and post, Part A
  (The Urban Institute for Human Services, Inc., 1978)

2) The Affective Domain

- Attitude Scales

  pre-test - "Identification with the Underdog"
  (Schuman and Harding, 1963)

  post-test - "Social Problems Questionnaire"
  (Schuman and Harding, 1963)

- Historical Facts Quiz, pre and post, Part B
  (The Urban Institute for Human Services, Inc., 1978)

3) The Social Domain

- Interaction Systems

  Behavior Scores System (Borgatta, 1963)

  Social Interaction Sequence Analysis
  (The Urban Institute for Human Services, Inc., 1978)

  Sociometric Patterns
  (The Urban Institute for Human Services, Inc., 1978)

- Group Roles and Process

  Group Process Observer Report Form
  (The Urban Institute for Human Services, Inc., 1978)

4) The Personal History Domain

- Background Information Sheet

(The Urban Institute for Human Services, Inc., 1978)

B. Training of Observers

Two Black females, one an experienced psychometrist, the other, an educational researcher, were trained as observers by the staff of the Urban Institute for Human Services, Inc. The observers were given a project orientation and were instructed extensively on the use of each of the observation instruments. Practice exercises were used to establish interscorer reliability. After the completion of the pilot study, the debriefing session was held to obtain the observers insights regarding the workshop, problems encountered and suggestions for format changes and instrument refinement.

C. Selection of the Research Site

The influence of environment on the individual is a critical factor, therefore, careful consideration was given to site selection for the pilot study. Two criteria were used for selection: 1) the availability of special facilities; and 2) the location's degree of legitimacy. Facilities with one-way mirrors were needed to allow observers maximum accessibility and freedom in their recordings while remaining unobtrusive. The intent was to reduce the amount of outside interference in the group process. Secondly, we wanted an environment that conveyed the sense of importance and seriousness of the research task.

An academic environment was considered the optimal choice. Thus, the prestigious University of California at Berkeley was the site selected for the race relations workshop. The all-day session was held in Tolman Hall, the university's education-psychology building.

D. Selection of Participants

The participants in the pilot study were carefully selected to comprise a diverse cross-section of people in regard to sex, ethnicity, age, and the disabled. Dr. Mona Scott, an ongoing consultant to the ONR project, was responsible for participant identification. Her vast network of contacts within the Bay Area provided a large pool of potential participants.

Two weeks prior to the race relations workshop, contact letters were mailed to twenty-five potential participants. The letter introduced the Urban Institute for Human Services, Inc., explained the purpose and format of the workshop and requested their participation. Fifteen individuals returned the form agreeing to participate.

Records were kept on the acceptances, rejections, cancellations and additions to the participant list. It was hypothesized that this information might have utility in the analysis phase. In fact, there were some interesting incidents regarding the final composition of the workshop participants.

Prior to the workshop, a white female participant requested that a Black female friend be included in the workshop because of her expertise and experiences. A few days before the workshop, two Black males cancelled

without explanation and were replaced with a Chicano female and another Black male. The day of the workshop, a White male participant brought a Black female to participate in the workshop without prior notification. A Black male and a Black female arrived at the workshop who had sent in the written form earlier stating that they would be unable to attend. The day of the workshop there were a total of seventeen participants.

III. THE PILOT STUDY

The pilot study consisted of a race relations workshop conducted on July 29, 1978 by the Urban Institute for Human Services, Inc. The race relations workshop was carefully designed to focus on the issue of race and to promote interracial interactions.

A. Theoretical Rationale for the Workshop Format

From a review of the literature, methods and techniques were incorporated into the workshop format based on their documented effectiveness for behavioral and/or attitudinal change. Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) specified two critical strategies in affecting change: 1) active participation; and 2) persuasive communication. The authors defined active participation as participation on the part of the subject to acquire new information by means of direct experience. In reference to the workshop, opportunities for active participation were provided in the small group task and the large group discussion.

Persuasive information is defined as the provision of information to the subject by an outside source. Williams (1947) listed the following as elements that maximize the effectiveness of the persuasive

appeal: 1) auditory stimuli is more effective than visual stimuli; 2) speakers are more effective than printed matter; 3) oral presentations are more effective in small groups than in large audiences; 4) presentations are more effective when the material is linked with prestige symbols; 5) the use of several channels of communication simultaneously is more effective than the use of only one medium; and 6) pictures and cartoons have greater attention-gaining value than the written word (p. 31). The workshop's slide presentation "Return to the Source" narrated on audio tape by Dr. Asa G. Hilliard integrated all of the above elements in order to insure a greater success rate in terms of behavioral change.

The workshop consisted of four major sections:

1. individual written forms including pre and post measures
2. a structured small group task with discussions
3. the slide presentation "Return to the Source"
4. an informal large group discussion

B. The Agenda

The following is the agenda for the July 29, 1979 Race Relations Workshop:

C. General Assumptions

The following general assumptions were tested by the workshop:

1. Initially, individuals will associate with others based on perceptual similarities such as sex, race, age, physical characteristics and appearance. This assumption is based on Heider's work (1958) on interpersonal relations in which he theorized that people who perceive themselves to be similar to each other tend to feel the same about each other.

2. A common goal or task will supercede perceptual similarities as the basis for group formation. Therefore, groups will recombine in order to attain a goal or accomplish a task (Williams, 1947).

3. Minority participants and non-minority participants who have had previous positive interracial contacts will be the most receptive to the information contained in the slide presentation and thus are the most likely to express attitudinal and behavioral change. "Imparting of information will have greater positive effects upon individuals who stand in an intermediate attitudinal position than upon those at either extreme" (Williams, 1947, p. 64).

D. Description, Assumption and Purpose of the Workshop's Research Instruments

1. Individual Forms - Background Information Sheet, Attitude Survey, and Historical Facts Quiz

Measure - Background Information Sheet

Description: The Background Information Sheet includes variables such as the participants' sex, age, ethnicity, occupation, education, geographical region of birth, marital status, religious affiliation and type of interracial contacts or experiences.

Assumption - The configuration of individual background characteristics will predispose the subject toward positive, negative or neutral racial attitudes and behaviors.

Purpose of the Instrument - To obtain demographic characteristics on each individual in order to divide the sample and to define structural variables such as income, occupation, education, Information obtained from these forms are used for speculative explanatory purposes in the analysis.

Measure - Attitude Survey (Pre and Post)

Description: The pre-measure was the 11-item attitude scale "Identification with the Underdog" developed by Schuman and Harding (1963). The post-measure was "Social Problems Questionnaire" a supplementary attitude scale designed by Harding and Schuman found to correlate highly with the "identification" scale.

Assumption - Through the use of active participation and a persuasive communication stimulus (slide presentation) a measurable positive change in racial attitudes will occur.

Purpose of the Instrument - To collect quantitative data on attitudes and attitude change as measured by valid and reliable attitude scales on prejudice.

Measure - Historical Facts Quiz (Pre and Post)

Description: This 11 item, 2 part quiz was designed by Hilliard (1978) to test knowledge and affect regarding the slide presentation "Return to the Source"

Assumption - Exposure to factual information will result in a positive attitude and behavior change.

Purpose of the Instrument - To obtain baseline data on knowledge and interpretations of the slide presentation's contents and to measure the impact of the slide presentation by the change in post-test responses.

2. Group Activities - Small Group Task and Large Group Discussion

Activity - Small Group Task

Description: The small group task was developed by the UIHS staff. The task required the group to divide into teams for and against the controversial, racially-loaded Baake case and debate their respective positions.

Assumption - A common task and goal will reduce race and sex differences within a group.

Purpose of the Activity

1. to develop solidarity and cohesiveness
2. to focus on the race issue in order to elicit racially legitimating and delegitimating behaviors.
3. to observe behaviors in a stressful situation
4. to observe group dynamics, i.e., emergence of roles, verbal and non-verbal communication patterns.

The small group task was audiotaped.

Measure: Sociometric Patterns - Seating Position Diagram

Description: Diagrams were designed according to the layout of workshop rooms. Observers recorded the seating positions of participants in both the small and large group activities.

Assumption - Initially, people will tend to sit next to those who are presumed to share backgrounds similar to themselves. After interacting, individuals will sit next to another based on different criteria, e.g., similar interests, common goals, compatible personalities, etc.

Purpose of the Instrument - To observe the voluntary selection and shifts in seating positions by participants. According to the research literature, the frequency and direction of interaction is influenced by one's seat position within the group. Seating choices may indicate social preferences.

Measure: Behavior Scores System

Description: This is a social interaction system constructed by Borgatta (1963) for a task-specific situation. With this system, observers record the frequency of behaviors in six categories. These six behavioral categories are derived from two basic dimensions: assertiveness and sociability.

Assumption - Those most receptive to the workshop objectives will interact more and assume dominant or pro-active roles within the group. Those least receptive to the goals of the workshop will have fewer interactions and will assume roles that impede group progress.

Purpose of the Instrument - To record individual behaviors both verbal and non-verbal within the context of the group.

Measure: Group Process Observer Report Form

Description: This form was completed by observers to identify individual roles within the group and group characteristics as a whole. The form was adopted from the work of Borgatta (1968), Benne and Sheats (1948).

Assumption: Those who are most extreme (positive or negative) in their racial attitudes will assume dominant roles.

Purpose: To identify roles individuals assume in the group whether or not these roles are maintained. To determine attributes characteristic of the collective group that may relate to the objectives of the study.

IV. WORKSHOP

Activity: Large Group Discussion

Description: This was an unstructured activity to discuss reactions, questons or opinions on the slide presentation "Return to the Source".

Assumption - Those most positively affected by the slide presentation will interact more, share more information and experiences than those least affected or negatively affected.

Purpose of the Activity

1) to observe behavioral change or resistance to change as a result of the slide presentation
2) to observe changes in patterns of interactions
3) to identify specific racial legitimizing and delegitimizing behaviors.

This session was audiotaped.

Measure: Social Interaction Sequence Analysis

Description: An observer's form for recording participants' verbal initiations and responses sequentially.

Assumption - Those most positively affected by the research stimulus will have a higher frequency of interactions.

Purpose of the Instrument - To record sequences of verbal initiations and responses. The sequence analysis addressed the following questions: Who initiated interaction and to whom? Who responded to initiations? Were interactions spontaneous or delayed?

It should be noted that a peer assessment form was also one of the research instruments. This form was to be completed by the workshop participants at the end of the small group task. However, each group, independently of the other, resisted and/or refused to evaluate their peers. Both groups cited divisiveness and disruption of newly formed group solidarity as reasons for their refusal.

The following is a Summary Chart of the Research Measures:

Summary Chart of Research Measures

Research Instrument Methods	Dimension or Behavior(s) Measured	Completed by	Number of Administrations
Background Information Sheet	Individual demographic characteristics, e.g., sex, age, ethnicity, education, occupation, etc.	Participant	1
Attitude Surveys	Attitudes toward racial and ethnic groups. Attitude change as function of research stimulus (slide presentation).	Participant	2 (Pre and Post)
Historical Facts Quiz	Projective measure to obtain baseline data on knowledge and interpretation of the slide presentation's contents. Change in knowledge and interpretation as consequence of research stimulus.	Participant	2 (Pre and Post)
Small Group Task	Group Dynamics; individual behaviors and actions within context of the group.	Participant Group	1
Group Process Observer Report Form	Identification of group roles, group characteristics and processes in both small group and large group tasks	Observers	3
Sociometric Seating Position	Seating Patterns of participants	Observers	3
Behavior Scores System	Interaction patterns; role definition, individual behaviors within the group.	Observers	1
Large Group Discussion	Behavioral changes in terms of responses to the slide presentation "Return to the Source"	Participant Group	1
Social Interaction Sequence Analysis	Sequential interaction patterns; frequency of initiations/responses	Observers	1

V. RESULTS

The purposes of the pilot study was delineate and define behavioral patterns and trends for the specification of behavioral criteria. With such a small sample and with a sample that was not selected at random by the most rigorous criteria possible, the interpretation of the data is in terms of salient trends rather than in terms of statistical significance. Our intent was to test the appropriateness, potential sensitivity and applicability of the research measures and methods in relation to our research objectives. For the analysis and presentation of the results, the sample was divided into four groups: minority females, minority males, white females and white males.

A. Background Information Data -- A Summary Participant Profile

Over two-thirds (70%) of the workshop participants were between the ages of 25 and 45 (refer to Table 1). The majority of the participants were born in either the South (35%) or the West (29%) and were female (59%) and Black (59%). In terms of marital status, slightly more than a third (35%) were married and forty-six percent (46%) were either single or divorced. Seventeen percent (17%) were living with someone.

The participant population is highly educated, seventy-one percent (71%) had a college degree or some graduate experience. In terms of religious denomination, the category with the highest percentage (35%) was the "not applicable or no answer" category. The Catholic religion had the next highest percentage with 23%.

Table 1

Background Information

The following is a breakdown on the background characteristics of the workshop participants. (Total N = 17).

1. Ages:

18-24	25-30	31-35	36-40
12% (2)	23.5% (4)	6% (1)	23.5% (4)

41-45	46-50	over 50
17% (3)	6% (1)	30% (2)

2. Place of Birth:

East	Midwest	South	West	Foreign Country
17% (3)	6% (1)	35% (6)	29% (5)	12% (2)

3. Sex:

Male	Female
41% (7)	59% (10)

4. Marital Status:

Single	Married	Living	Separated	Divorced
29% (5)	35% (6)	17% (3)	0% (0)	17% (3)

5. Number of Children:

Number:		Years:	
0	47% (8)	0-2	0% (0)
1	12% (2)	3-5	3% (1)
2-3	23% (4)	6-10	0% (0)
4-5	12% (2)	11-14	15% (5)
over 5	6% (1)	15-19	24% (8)
		20 or over	33% (11)
		N.A.	24% (8)

Background Information
Page 2

6. Ethnic Background:

Asian 6% (1) Black 59% (10) Caucasian 29% (5) Hispanic 0% (0) Other 6% (1)

7. Highest Level of Education Completed:

8th grade 0% (0) High school grad. 12% (2) College grad. 23% (4)

Some high school 0% (0) Some college 18% (3) Some grad school 29% (5)

Graduate or professional degree 18% (3)

8. Religious Demonimation:

Protestant 18% (3) Jewish 6% (1) N.A. 35% (6) Catholic 23% (4) Other 18% (3)

9. Type of Residence:

Apartment 35% (6) House 65% (11)

10. Location of Residence:

Urban 65% (11) Suburban 35% (6) Rural 0% (0)

11. Ownership:

Own 47% (8) Rent 53% (9)

12. Number of Years in California:

Less than 1 year 0% (0) 4-5 years 0% (0) 11-20 years 29% (50

1-3 years 12% (2) 6-10 years 6% (1) over 20 years 53% (9)

14. Previous Race Relations Experiences:

Have persons of different races as close friend/friends. 94% (16)

Work with person(s) of a different ethnic/racial background. 94% (16)

Studied race relations in school. 41% (7)

Participated in other workshops involving race relations. 65% (11)

Live in an interracial community. 94% (16)

Taught seminars/courses on race relations on minority groups. 23% (4)

Others (specify) 18% (3)

15. Membership in any Groups Working in Human Rights or Civil Rights:

Yes 35% (6) No 59% (10) N.A. 6% (1)

Most of the participants lived in a house in an urban area. All the participants have lived in California for eleven or more years. In terms of interracial contact, nearly all the participants (94%) live or have lived in an interracial community, have friends or worked with persons of different ethnic backgrounds. Almost two-thirds (65%) had participated in other race relations workshops but the majority (59%) did not belong to any human or civil rights organizations.

B. Attitude Survey I (Pre-Test)

The pre-test Attitude Survey was the "Identification with the Underdog" scale developed by Schuman and Harding (1963). This scale consists of 11 short stories for which the respondent has to select a response which describes how a minority member is likely to react in a difficult social situation. There are four alternatives to each story. Of these four alternatives only one is characterized by sympathetic identification, the other three indicate either difference, agnosticism or interpretation of the situation as beneficial for the minority group member.

A respondent scores one point if he chooses the sympathetic alternative, three points if he chooses any of the other three alternatives. Individual total scores range from 11 (total sympathy) to 33 (total lack of sympathy).

Split-half reliability for this scale ranged from .62 to .76 and a test-retest reliability coefficient of .80.

The results from this scale (Refer to Table 2) show that the group in general tend toward the sympathetic end of the continuum. The analysis of group responses indicate that males are more sympathetic than women

Table 2

Results from Attitude Survey I (Pre-test)

"Identification with the Underdog"

Group by Ethnicity and Sex	N	Raw Scores	Mean Scores
"Minority" Females	7	121	18
"Minority" Males	4	60	15
White Females	3	61	20.3
White Males	2	32	16
Total	16	274	17.1

with Black males the most sympathetic. White females were the least sympathetic, minority females the next least sympathetic.

There are certain interesting response trends for these items where there was considerable deviation. For example for those who did not give a sympathetic response the tendency was to score the neutral or noncommital response, i.e. the one that stated that it was impossible to know, how the minority specified in the story would feel or what his/her motives were the item which had unanimous agreement was item #9 which asked why Black teenagers would picket a store that did not allow them to sit at the same counter as whites. Since this description is historically based on the Southern sit-ins, the participants probably had factual knowledge on which to base their response. The items on which minorities were divided in their response were items that included a response favoring racial homogeneity, i.e., "minorities" may prefer or be satisfied to be with their own group.

These deviations or trends appear to suggest a possible growing awareness and sensitivity to ethnic differences and ethnic integrity by the unwillingness to project subjective feelings onto an ethnically different individual or to demonstrate pride and satisfaction in one's own ethnic group.

C. Behavior Scores System

The Behavior Scores System developed by Borgatta (1963) is an adaptation of social interaction systems developed by Bales; Chapple, and others. The primary focus of this system is on categories corresponding to peer assessments. The two underlying factors of the Behavior Scores System (BSS) is assertiveness and sociability.

There are six scoring categories derived from these two factors which are: 1) neutral communications; 2) assertive or dominant acts; 3) antagonistic acts; 4) withdrawal acts; 5) supportive acts; and 6) assertive supportive acts. Both individual and group response can be recorded.

This interaction system was used during the small group task. There were two small groups however results (Refer to table 3) will be presented for only one group because data on the other small group are incomplete.

In general, the most frequently scored categories were neutral communications and assertive dominant acts. The next most frequently scored category was the assertive supportive acts category. The category that had the lowest frequency was category 4 acts of withdrawal. There were slightly more displays of antagonistic acts than supportive acts. From this data, the group can be characterized as very self-assertive but slightly antagonistic.

Further analysis indicate that the women were much more dominant than the men, perhaps because women comprised 60% of the group. All those above the mean in assertive or dominant acts were women and with the exception of one male women were above the mean in assertive supportive acts. All the men were below the group mean for total responses for all categories. Women were both the most supportive and the most antagonistic. Black women had the highest percentages in both these categories. However, the white female in the group had the highest rating in the assertive dominant acts and the assertive supportive acts categories. However, from other information, her dominance diminished

Table 3

Results of Behavior Scores System Ratings

Group by Ethnicity and Sex	Behavior Scores System Categories*																				
	1			2			3			4			5			6			Total		
	Raw Score	Mean Score	% of Total	Raw Score	Mean Score	% of Total	Raw Score	Mean Score	% of Total	Raw Score	Mean Score	% of Total	Raw Score	Mean Score	% of Total	Raw Score	Mean Score	% of Total	Raw Score	Mean Score	% of Total
"Minority" Female	87	21.8	55%	84	21	56%	31	7.8	79%	10	2.5	63%	22	5.5	76%	35	8.8	59%	269	67.3	60%
"Minority" Male	28	14	18%	26	13	17%	0	0	0%	5	2.5	31%	2	1	7%	9	4.5	15%	70	35	15%
White Female	30	30	19%	29	29	19%	5	5	13%	0	0	0%	5	5	17%	15	15	26%	84	84	19%
White Male	12	12	8%	12	12	8%	3	3	8%	1	1	6%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	28	28	6%
Total Group	157	19.6	34.8%	151	18.9	33.5%	39	4.9	8.7%	16	2	3.5%	29	3.6	6.5%	59	74	13%	451	56.4	100%

* Catetory Definitions are:

1 = neutral communications
2 = assertive or dominant acts
3 = antagonistic acts
4 = withdrawal acts
5 = supportive acts
6 = assertive supportive acts

by the time that the task was completed. The sociometric data indicates that this woman separated herself from her assigned group toward the end of the task). A Black male had the consistently lowest ratings in all categories. In addition, Blacks had the highest withdrawal ratings.

In summary, females were the most dominant, supportive, and antagonistic. The white female was the most dominant and the Black male was the most reticent. The men in general were subdued and the least vocal in the task situation these findings are corroborated by the group process data and sociometric patterns data.

D. Sociometric Seating Patterns

The observers coded the seating patterns of each participant three times during the workshop, twice during the morning small group task and once during the afternoon large group discussion. The results illustrate shifts in the group's composition. First of all at the beginning of the morning session, participants were clustered primarily by ethnicity, and sex, i.e. Blacks tended to set together and women tended to sit next to each other.

Consistently, throughout the sessions males sat at the corners or extremes of the table. According to Hare and Bales participants who sit at the corners of a rectangular table tend to contribute least to discussion. This finding was borne out by the data on verbal interactions. Men contributed considerably less to the discussion than women. Furthermore, in the small group task the white males seated themselves at the extreme and distanced themselves more from the group. At the end of the small group task in one group, a white female physically removed herself from her assigned subgroup and sat

at the extreme of the table. From observer data and notes there was a considerable reduction in this individual's dominance and participation.

Hare and Bales also hypothesized that those who tend to dominate choose the most central seats. This finding was also corroborated in both the small group task and the large group discussion.

One finding that was not confirmed by the data was that the leaders choose a position at the end of a rectangular table. This was not true in the large group discussion. Two Black males were in that position but they had a very low rate of participation in terms of verbal interactions.

In the large group discussion there was greater integration of the different ethnic groups, however, there was still clustering by sex, men tended to sit with men and women tended to sit with women. There was no discernible seating pattern based on the morning's small group assignment. Social bonds formed by the small group task were not evident by the seating positions in the large group discussion.

In summary, women tended to choose positions of dominance. The men tended to remain on the edges of the group, these are positions for observation rather than participation. Racial separation had diminished by the afternoon session and there was greater intermingling across racial lines.

E. Group Process Report Data

The Group Process Observer Report form required observers to identify roles played by participants in the group process and to rate specific characteristics of the group as a whole. These forms were completed three times by observers during the workshop. A form was completed for: 1) each of the small group task subgroup; 2) the small group as a whole;

and 3) the large group discussion. The form contained seven role categories; group leader, facilitator, most sociable, critic, most reticent, most dominant, and obstructionist. More than one individual could be nominated per category and conversely, and individual could be nominated for more than one category. Also, a category could have no nominations, if it were not appropriate for the group.

From the results (Refer to Table 4) females clearly were the leaders in the small group task, although no designated leader emerged in the large group discussion. Females were also the most dominant with Black females being the most frequently nominated. However, white and Asian males were selected as dominant in the small group task, however, this shifted in the large group discussion when Black males became dominant. Both Black and white, males and females were identified as most reticent in the small groups. However, Black females were not identified as reticent in the large group. Conversely, the opposite results occurred for the Chicana female who was a leader in the small group and one of the most reticent in the large group. Black females were nominated as the most sociable in all the group settings. Females, both white and Black, were the critics in the small groups. Only one individual (white female) was perceived to be an obstructionist and this occurred only in the small group task subgroups. The category that received the greatest number of nominations in the small group task was the group facilitator category. Members from all four ethnic groups were selected. However, in the large group only one person (Black male) was selected as the group facilitator. This reduction may be due to the presence of Asa Hilliard (a Black male) at the discussion as leader and facilitator of the discussion.

Table 4

Frequency of Group Role Nominations by Ethnicity and Sex

Group Leader	"Minority" Female			"Minority" Male			White Female			White Male			Total	% of Total
	Small Group	Large Group	Total	Small Group	Large Group	Total	Small Group	Large Group	Total	Small Group	Large Group	Total		
Leader	5	0	5	1	0	1	2	0	2	0	0	0	8	16%
Group Facilitator	2	0	2	2	1	3	2	0	2	1	0	1	8	16%
Most Sociable	5	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	12%
Critic	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	4%
Most Reticent	2	1	3	4	1	5	3	1	4	1	1	2	14	27%
Most Dominant	6	1	7	2	1	3	1	0	1	1	0	1	12	23%
Obstructionist	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	2%
Total			24			12			11			4	51	
% of Total			47%			23½%			21½%			8%		100%

Clearly the small group task allowed for greater role differentiations and participation. There was more diversity by ethnicity and sex in the small group role. In large group, Blacks and females had the most role visibility.

In terms of group characteristics in the small group task, both groups were perceived as being very involved in the task, interested, and positive. However, one group was seen as being laissez-faire in its leadership style but working together as a cohesive unit and being both task and personality-oriented in regard to group focus. The other group was rated as democratic in their group style but having less group solidarity (acting individually rather than as a cohesive unit) and being personality rather than task oriented in terms of focus.

In regard to the large group discussion, the group was rated as involved, interested, positive and cohesive.

F. Social Interaction Sequence Analysis

The social interaction sequence analysis was a form used by observers during the large group discussion to record the individual participants' initiations and responses in the dialogue sequence. The results (Refer to Table 5) clearly demonstrate that Black females cominated the discussion. They were responsible for almost two-thirds of the initiations and 59% of the responses. Black males had the next highest communication rate accounting for 22% of the initiations and 24% of the responses. Together Blacks contributed approximately 85% of the discussion. White males did not initiate conversation and had a very low response rate, (3%). White females hade a higher initiation than response rate but both were low. The frequency distribution on the verbal interactions of the large group discussion indicate that the

Table 5

Results from Social Interaction Sequence Analysis

Activity: Large Group Discussion

Group Participation by Ethnicity and Sex

	Initiations	Responses
"Minority" Females	63%	59%
"Minority" Males	28%	34%
White Females	9%	4%
White Males	0%	3%
	T = 32	T = 137

stimulus, the slide presentation, "Return to the Source" had an activating effect for Blacks and a suppressing effect for Whites. This shift in dominance and participation is highlighted in a closer study of two participants, one Black male and one white female. The Black male had low participation in the morning sessions and had the highest communication rate of the males in the afternoon session. The white female had a high communication rate in the morning and was nominated as a dominant leader and facilitator. Yet her contribution to the afternoon dialogue was very low.

Observations were made at the end of the workshop to record the informal unstructured interactions that occurred. Nineteen dyads were observed, 10 of which were interethnic and 9 were male-female dyads. This trend toward a relaxation of ethnic and sex barriers was documented. There was increased across ethnic and sex lines in the afternoon particularly by the end of the workshop.

Historical Facts Quiz

The historical facts quiz was a pre-post measure developed by Asa Hilliard to obtain baseline data on the participants' knowledge of African, Afro-European and Afro-American history and to assess the degree of impact of the slide presentation. The historical facts quiz and the attitude survey were the primary participant measures of attitude change. The quiz was designed as both a test of historical knowledge and as a projective technique.

Design of the Test

Eleven slides from the slide presentation were selected, converted into photographs, and bound. Each participant received a binder of the photographs and was asked to answer the following two questions for each picture: 1) "What information can you give about this picture?"; 2) "Is this information important? Explain."

Since the questions were open-ended, a coding scheme was developed from our legitimation model to analyze the responses. The responses were coded in terms of type of response, and the amount or units of information given. According to the racial legitimation model, behaviors (which, in this case, are written responses) can be classified according to positive, negative and neutral forms of recognition and non-recognition. From this model, responses were coded according to the following categories:

1) No information
These responses were either no answers, don't knows or can't remember.

2) Descriptive - non-racial
These responses were factual descriptions without any racial reference. For example: "This is a picture of King Tut".

3) Descriptive - racial
These responses were factual descriptions with racial references. Example: "This is King Tut, a great Negro ruler of Egypt."

4) Interpretive - non-racial
These responses were elaborations or interpretations of the pictorial stimulus without a racial reference. The responses tended to be either elaborative, subjective/affective or projective. Example: "These are huge statues, some of the biggest in the world. The sphinx is a mythical creature combining the male and female sides, the left and right side of the brain. The sphinx is an archetypal symbol of wisdom."

5) Interpretive - racial
These responses were also elaborations of the pictorial stimuli and were often projective. They integrated the racial content into their interpretations.
Example: "The Queen looks like an old Black grandmother; someone most Black people would come into contact with on an intimate and daily basis. Such recognition of affinity takes the distance out of Egyptian history . . . One also gains pride from being able to incorporate this historical figure into one's cultural history."

These categories correspond to the categories of the recognition-non-recognition continuum of the racial legitimation model represented in Technical Report #1, page 79. Since the slide presentation is a pictorial corrective history of African peoples, the dominant theme is racial. Therefore, the non-information category relates to the negative and neutral non-recognition categories of denial or no knowledge/no feeling. The non-racial coding categories (descriptive and interpretive) incorporate all three forms of the non-recognition pole; transformation, denial and no knowledge/no feeling. The descriptive-racial coding category relates to the neutral recognition category of knowledge/no feeling. The interpretive-racial category includes the positive and negative aspects of recognition, i.e., respect and disrespect.* The following chart illustrates the correspondence between the coding and conceptual categories.

---

* From the data, no responses were categorized under disrespect.

Correspondence of Coding and Conceptual Classification Schemes

Coding		Conceptual
No information	Non-Recognition	denial (negative) no knowledge/no feeling (neutral)
Non-racial (descriptive) and interpretive)	Non-Recognition	denial (negative no knowledge/no feeling (neutral) transformation (positive)
Descriptive - Racial	Recognition	Knowledge/no feeling (neutral)
Interpretive - Racial	Recognition	Disrespect (negative) Respect (positive)

The units of information analysis is the frequency of discrete units of information given for each written response. Mean responses were computed for each of the four groups. The following is an example of how the information units were scored.

Example: Response to Question 1, Picture 3
"The statue in this picture is either Egyptian or Greco-Roman. The other people have been superimposed onto the photo."

This statement received a score of 2 for a two information unit response. One unit of information refers to the origin of the stimulus object and one unit of information describes a particular aspect of the photograph.

Results of Historical Facts Quiz

Separate analyses were performed for each of the two historical facts questions since they elicited qualitatively different responses.

Question 1 Results. On question 1, whites have a much higher "no information" rate than minority participants on the pre-test (Refer to Tables 6 & 7). Of the total pre-test responses, the greatest percentage for whites was the no information category. White females had the highest percentage of no response or no information on both the pre (42%) and post (24%) measures. This was not true for white males, however. Their no-information rate was 27% of the total responses on the pre-test and 0% on the post-test. The percentages for the no-information category increased slightly for "minority" males on the post-test, from 5% to 7% and decreased slightly for "minority"

Table 6

Frequencies of Racial References on Historical Facts Quiz

Question 1

Group by Ethnicity and Sex	No Information		Non-Racial		Racial	
	Pre-test	Post-test	Pre-test	Post-test	Pre-test	Post-test
White Male	27%	0%	54%	32%	19%	68%
White Female	42%	24%	33%	12%	24%	63%
"Minority" Male	5%	7%	37%	18%	58%	74%
"Minority" Female	6%	4%	38%	32%	56%	64%

Table 7

Distribution of Participant Responses to Historical Facts Quiz

Question 1

Group by Ethnicity and Sex	No Information		Descriptive		Interpretive	
	Pre-test	Post-test	Pre-test	Post-test	Pre-test	Post-test
White Male	27%	0%	32%	82%	41%	18%
White Female	42%	24%	30%	51%	27%	24%
"Minority Male"	5%	7%	42%	36%	53%	56%
"Minority Female"	6%	4%	33%	46%	61%	50%

males on the post-test, from 5% to 7% and decreased slightly for "minority" females, from 6% to 4%. The no-information percentages were very low for minorities on both the pre and post-tests.

On the pre-test, over half (54%) of the responses for white males had no racial reference. These responses were evenly divided between descriptive-factual responses and interpretive-elaborative answers. Responses with racial content had the lowest percentages (19%) of all the responses. Five percent (5%) were descriptive and 14% were interpretive. On the post-test, there was a dramatic increase in racially-oriented responses, particularly in the descriptive category. Descriptive-racial responses were 5% on pre-test and 50% on the post-test. There was only a slight increase in interpretive racial responses, from 14% to 18%. There was a slight increase in descriptive non-racial responses, from 27% to 32% and a substantial decrease in interpretive - non-racial responses from 27% to 0%. On the post test, the descriptive category (racial and non-racial) accounted for 82% of white male responses.

On the pre-test, a third of the responses for white females were non-racial and 24% had racial references. The remainder of the responses (42%) were either no answer or don't knows. However, on the post-test, there was a significant increase in descriptive-racial responses, from 6% to 45%. This outcome was similar to that for white males. There was a decrease in the non-informational category (from 42% to 24%), and the non-racial categories, i.e., the descriptive - non-racial category (from 24% to 6%) and the

interpretive - non-racial (9% to 6%). The interpretive-racial category remained the same (18%). Racial responses, constituted 63% of white female post-test responses whereas non-racial responses only comprised 12% of the total.

"Minority" males had a high percentage (58%) of racial responses on the pre-test. Thirty-seven percent (37%) of the pre-test responses were non-racial and only 5% were no information. On the post-test racially descriptive and interpretive responses increased to 74% or three-fourths of the total responses. Only 18% of the post-test responses were non-racial.

Similar to "minority" males, "minority" females had a high frequency (56%) of racial responses on the pre-test with the highest percentage (35%) in the interpretive-racial category. Thirty-eight percent of the responses were non-racial and only 6% were no information. On the post-test, racial responses increased to 64% or almost two thirds of the total responses. In terms of non-racial responses, there was a considerable decrease in the interpretive category (from 26% to 14%) but an increase in the descriptive category (from 12% to 18%). The no information category decreased by 2% (from 6% to 4%) on the post-test.

The results from the units of information analysis for Question 1 indicate that minorities had a higher mean response than whites on the pre-test (Refer to Table 8). "Minority" females had the highest rate of information units with a mean unit response of 16.7. White females had the lowest mean unit response of 13. However, the

Table 8

Unit of Information Analysis for Historical Facts Quiz

Mean Responses by Ethnicity and Sex

Group by Ethnicity and Sex	Question 1		Question 2	
	Pre-test	Post-test	Pre-test	Post-test
White Male	13.5	16	7.5	15.5
White Female	13	16.3	14	10
"Minority" Male	16.2	13.8	11	10.2
"Minority" Female	16.7	14.3	11.4	12.6

pattern reverses on the post-test. Whites provide more information than minorities on the post-test. Furthermore, white females have the highest mean response of 16.3 on the post-test. Whites increased their response rate on the post-test whereas minorities rate decreased. Females have a slightly higher mean response than their male counterparts on the post-test.

Question 2 Results. Since Question 2 asked the participants to explain the importance of the pictorial stimuli, the interpretive category tended to have higher percentages for all groups than Question 1 (Refer to Tables 9 & 10). On the pre-test, the percentages for the no-information category was higher than for Question 1. The percentages ranged from 34.5% for "minority" males to 70% for white females. In terms of the informational categories, minorities had consistently higher frequencies of racial responses than whites on the pre-test. White males had the highest percentage of non-racial responses and of descriptive responses. "Minority" males had the highest percentage of interpretive responses whereas "minority" females had the greatest number of racial responses.

On the post-test, the percentages for the no-information category decreased for all groups. White females still had the greatest frequency of no information whereas white males had the lowest. Of the informational categories, the interpretive categories constituted the majority of responses for all groups with the interpretive-racial category having the highest percentages across groups. As on the pre-test, "minority" males had the highest

Table 9

Percentage of Racial Responses to Historical Facts Quiz

Question 2

Group by Ethnicity and Sex	No Information		Non-Racial Responses		Racial Responses	
	Pre-test	Post-test	Pre-test	Post-test	Pre-test	Post-test
White Male	41%	9%	41%	46%	18%	45%
White Female	70%	42%	18%	18%	12%	39%
"Minority" Male	34.5%	22%	36.5%	38%	29%	40%
"Minority" Female	40%	14%	19%	37%	42%	49%

55

Table 10

Distribution of Participant Responses on Historical Facts Quiz

Question 2

Group by Ethnicity and Sex	No Information		Descriptive		Interpretive	
	Pre-test	Post-test	Pre-test	Post-test	Pre-test	Post-test
White Male	41%	9%	31%	14%	28%	77%
White Female	70%	42%	0%	3%	30%	54%
"Minority" Male	34.5%	22%	2%	0%	63.5%	78%
"Minority" Female	40%	14%	6%	3%	55%	83%

percentage of interpretive responses and "minority" females had the most racial responses.

On the pre-test, the percentages for no information (41%) and non-racial responses (41%) were the same for white males. Only 18% of the responses were racial in nature. There was a slightly higher percentage (31%) of descriptive responses than interpretative responses (28%).

There was a dramatic shift in the response pattern of white males on the post-test. The no information category decreased from 41% to 9%. Over three-fourths (77%) of the responses were in the interpretive category of which 45% had racial references. The remainder (14%) of the responses were non-racial descriptive.

The informational response rate for white females was extremely low (30%) on the pre-test. All the responses fell into the interpretive category of which 18% were non-racial and 12% were racial in nature. On the post-test, the number of no answers or don't knows decreased but the percentage was still high (42%). There was a considerably higher percentage (54%) of interpretive responses than on the pre-test. Of the responses given, 39% were racial responses which contrast sharply with 12% on the pre-test.

On the pre-test, "minority" males had a high percentage (63.5) of interpretive responses. Of these responses, 34.5% were non-racial responses and 29% were racial. Slightly more than a third (34.5%) of the total responses were no information. Only 2% were descriptive, non-racial. The vast majority (78%) of the responses for "minority"

males were interpretive on the post-test. In contrast to the pre-test, the greater percentage (40%) of these responses were racially oriented although the difference between racial and non-racial interpretive post-test responses was very small. Twenty-two percent (22%) of the post-test responses were no information and there were no descriptive responses.

For "minority" females, over half (53%) of the pre-test responses were interpretive of which 39% were interpretive-racial responses. The no-information category had the next highest percentage (40%). The descriptive category only constituted 6% of the responses of which half (3%) were non-racial and half (3%) racial.

On the post-test the frequency of interpretive responses increased considerably from 55% to 83%. There were more racial responses (49%) than non-racial responses (37%). Fourteen per cent (14%) of the post responses were no information and 3% were descriptive with racial references.

The unit of information analysis shows an overall lower response rate for Question 2 than for Question 1. Also, there was not a consistent response pattern for the different ethnic groups on Question 2 as there was for Question 1.

On the pre-test, whites represented the extremes, in terms of mean responses. White females had the highest unit of information mean response on the pre-test and white males had the lowest. The high information rate of white females, can be attributed primarily to one respondent who wrote very extensive and lengthy responses to

Question 2. However, on the post-test, white males had the highest response rate and white females had the lowest.

For minorities, the mean response for males (11) and females (11.4) were very close on the pre-test. On the post-test, the "minority" males' response rate decreased whereas the rate increased for "minority" females.

Women tended to have a higher response rate than males on the pre-test. This trend held true for minorities but not for whites on the post-test.

In summary, there was an increased sensitivity and recognition of the stimuli's racial content on the post-test. Also, the racial responses were higher for Question 1 than for Question 2. The biggest increase in racial awareness was made by whites primarily because they had the lowest rate of racial responses on the pre-test for both questions. White males had higher post-test racial responses than white females. White females consistently had the highest rate of no information and the lowest rate of racial responses on the post-tests. "Minority" males had the highest rate of racial responses on both the pre and post measures for Question 1, and "minority" females had the highest pre and post racial responses for Question 2.

As expected, there was a higher percentage of descriptive responses for Question 1 than Question 2. Question 2 tended to elicit interpretive responses. There was an overall increase in descriptive responses on the post-test for all groups with the

exception of "minority" males. Minorities gave more interpretive responses in general, "minority" males in particular. On the post-tests white males had the biggest increase in descriptive responses on Question 1 and the largest increase in interpretive responses on Question 2. In terms of the unit of information analysis, Question 1 elicited more information than Question 2. In general, minorities generated more information on the pre-test and whites had a higher information output on the post-test. A deviation from this pattern occurred for question 2 where the information rate for white females was the highest on the pre-test and the lowest on the post-test. Moreover, there was an increase in information for minority females on the post-test for Question 2 which deviated from the general trend of information reduction by minorities on the post-tests.

Results of Large Group Discussion

The large group discussion that immediately followed the slide presentation was tape recorded, transcribed, and analyzed. Since this was an open-ended discussion, a coding scheme derived from our conceptual model was developed for the data analysis. Two coding schemes were used: 1) Coding scheme #1 rated positive and negative personal responses, positive and negative collective responses, and neutral responses. The purpose of this coding procedure scheme was to assess the degree of identification with the information presented. 2) Coding scheme #2 coded responses according to legitimation/delegitimation by or toward one's own group or by and toward other group(s). The purpose of this coding was to measure the degree of recognition or non-recognition of one's own group or another group. In addition, to the coding of responses a description of discussion response trends and themes was made.

For coding scheme #1, the definitions of the response categories are:

Personal Reference Responses (positive and negative)

This type of response refers to the relating of a personal experience, expression of personal feelings or any statement where the individual is speaking for himself/herself. These responses can be positive or negative in content.

Example: "I hate to recommend books but I just read one that just blew my mind . . ."

Collective Reference Responses (positive and negative)

This response code refers to statements where the individual is speaking collectively in terms of his/her own ethnic or radical group. These responses are also descriptions or interpretations about one's own ethnic group. These responses can be rated either positive or negative.

Example: "You also get into an educational exposure situation where we, what I mean by "we" are American Blacks, get very comfortable with what we sound like . . ."

Neutral Responses

These responses were nonevaluative questions or statements. They were primarily requests for clarification or elaboration.

Example: "What is the basis for that? Is it that the French Creoles are supposed to be superior?"

For Coding Scheme #2, the response categories are:

Legitimation Responses

There are four subcategories under legitimation:

1) legitimation by one's own racial/ethnic group where the participant refers to how his/her own group has recognized, accepted or reinforced the participant in some way;

2) legitimation toward one's own group where the individual recognizes, affirms, praises, accepts his/her group.

3) legitimation by other group where the participant or his/her group is recognized, accepted, praised or affirmed by a member(s) of another ethnic/racial group.

4) legitimation toward another group where the participant recognizes, accepts, praises or affirms another racial/ethnic group.

Delegitimation Responses

This category has four subcategories corresponding to the categories listed under legitimation responses. They are:

1) Delegitimation by one's own group are references regarding disrespect, criticism, negative or punitive actions of one's own ethnic/racial group toward the participant.

2) Delegitimation toward one's own group refers to responses by a participant that criticizes, disrespects, denies or "puts down" his/her own racial/ethnic group.

3) Delegitimation by other group are responses where an individual or his/her group is criticized, disrespected, denied or "put down" by a member(s) of another racial/ethnic group.

4) Delegitimation toward other group are responses where the individual criticizes, disrespects, denies or puts down another racial/ethnic group or members of the group.

Responses that could not be categorized as either legitimizing or delegitimizing were not coded. Responses that contained both legitimizing and delegitimizing statements were coded in both categories.

Results from Coding Scheme #1 (Degree of Identification)

In terms of frequency of response, whites had a lower response rate and white males had the lowest rate with only one (1) response during the large group discussion. Black females had the highest response rate with 18 codable responses. The other minority female did not participate in the discussion.

Regarding type of response, all statements by whites were either positive personal statements or neutral statements. There were twice as many neutral statements, however, than positive personal. The neutral statements were questions by a white female probing the remarks of a Black male on the positive effects of the slide presentation. None of the responses by whites were negative in content.

Minorities made more personal references than collective references. However, collective references accounted for almost a third of the responses (29% for minority group). There were more negative (41%) than positive (32%) responses. Approximately a fourth of the statements (26%) were neutral.

In examining sex differences within the minority category, a slightly different picture emerges. Black females make less personal references (33%) than minority males (56%) and half (50%) of the statements made are negative. The negative statements were either negative racial experiences of the participant or criticism of aspects of the Black experience. In addition, Black females

had three times (39%) more neutral responses than minority males (13%).

In general, males were more positive than females. Females were more negative or neutral with Black females being the most negative and white females the most neutral. Males had a higher percentage of personal references than females and minorities were the only ones who made collective references.

Table 11

Results from Coding Scheme #1

Percentage of Personal Reference, Collective Reference and Neutral Responses by Ethnicity and Sex

Type of Response	Minority Male	Black Female	White Male	White Female
Personal-Positive	31% (5)	--	100% (1)	20% (1)
Personal-Negative	25% (4)	33% (6)	-- (0)	-- (0)
Collective-Positive	25% (4)	11% (2)	-- (0)	-- (0)
Collective-Negative	6% (1)	17% (3)	-- (0)	-- (0)
Neutral	13% (2)	39% (7)	-- (0)	80% (4)
Total Number of Responses	16	18	1	5

Results from Coding Scheme #2 (Degree of Legitimation)

From the analysis of the data, the participants made more delegitimizing (55%) than legitimizing statements (45%). More delegitimizing (67%) and legitimizing (60%) statements were made regarding one's own racial/ethnic group than in another racial/ethnic group. Considerably more legitimizing responses were given toward one's group or another group (87%) than by one's group or another group (13%). This was not true for delegitimizing responses; 56% were made toward one's group or another group and 44% were by one's group or another group.

White males gave only one response which was a legitimation remark toward another racial group. White females, however, had a higher percentage of delegitimizing (75%) than legitimizing responses (25%) and all of their responses were directed toward another racial/ethnic group.

As expected, there was greater variation in the responses of minority participants. Minority males contributed more legitimizing (73%) than delegitimizing (27%) statements whereas Black females had a much higher percentage of delegitimizing (71%) than legitimizing (29%) responses. The majority of the legitimation responses made by minority males were references toward their own group. The majority of delegitimizing statements were delegitimation by their own group. For Black females, the majority of legitimation responses were either legitimation toward their own racial group or toward another racial/ethnic group. In terms of delegitimizing responses,

the majority were references of delegitimation toward their own racial group or by their own racial group.

In sum, males were considerably more legitimizing (75%) than females (25%). And minorities had a slightly higher rate of legitimizing responses (46%) than whites (40%). Most of the responses by minorities were in regard to their own group, particularly legitimation or delegitimation toward their own group. Whites, on the other hand, made references toward another racial/ethnic group.

Description of Large Group Discussion Trends

After a couple of remarks regarding technical errors in the slide presentation, the first half of the large group discussion takes on a funnel pattern. The discussion flows from a debate about the separation and discrimination between African and American Blacks to intra-group forms of racism perpetrated by American Blacks. The tone of discussion also changes from an academic debate to the relating of personal experiences. The discussion shifts in the second half to a lively interchange over the effects of the slide presentation. The principal advocates of the positive merits of the slide presentation are Black males. Their position is challenged by Black and White females. Toward the end of the second half the practical uses and importance of the slide presentation is discussed by minority males, Black and White females.

Table 12

Results from Coding Scheme #2

Percentage of Legitimation and Delegitimation Responses by Ethnicity and Sex

Type of Response	Minority Male	Black Female	White Male	White Female
Legitimation Responses				
By Own Group	-- (0)	-- (0)	-- (0)	-- (0)
Toward Own Group	64% (6)	12% (2)	-- (0)	-- (0)
By Other Group	9% (1)	6% (1)	-- (0)	-- (0)
Toward Other Group	-- (0)	12% (2)	100% (1)	25% (1)
Delegitimation Responses				
By Own Group	18% (2)	23% (4)	-- (0)	-- (0)
Toward Own Group	-- (0)	35% (6)	-- (0)	-- (0)
By Other Group	-- (0)	12% (2)	-- (0)	-- (0)
Toward Other Group	9% (1)	-- (0)	-- (0)	75% (3)
Total No. of Responses	11	17	1	4

VI. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of the study is as follows:

1) To specify behavioral criteria for assessing behavior which is of interest to human relations trainers, in particular that subset of behavior which can be described as racist.
2) To test the sensitivity of the specified criteria using a race relations training intervention, a slide tape presentation on the history of African people from ancient times to the present, in Africa and in the African diaspora.

Assumptions of the Study

The study was planned based on the following assumptions:

1) Racism in behavior operates as a part of the general culture and is, for the most part, independent of labels, such as, liberal or conservative.
2) The form of racist behavior is situation-dependent and will vary according to significant situational factors, such as the racial composition of the group.*

*For the purpose of this study, the research sample is divided into three groups: 1) all Black; 2) all White; and 3) mixed (Black and White).

Hypotheses

1) There will be differences among the three groups in terms of racial attitude as measured by scores on the racial attitude scale.

Coding and Analysis: Scores on the racial attitude scale range from 11 to 33. Differences between groups will be determined by using a one-way analysis of variance.

2) There will be differences among the three groups in terms of historical racial information as measured by written responses on the historical facts quiz.

Coding and Analysis: Frequency of responses for each of the 3 groups will be obtained by coding responses according to the legitimation coding scheme. The responses will be summarized according to their frequency of occurrence for each of the legitimation coding scheme's 24 categories. Where frequencies are sufficient to permit, chi-square analysis of frequencies across the 3 groups will be performed. Due to low frequencies in some categories it may be necessary to combine certain categories for analysis.

3) There will be differences among the three groups in terms of legitimation behavior as measured by the frequency of the types of responses in the large group discussions.

Coding and Analysis: The large group discussions will be coded from the typed transcripts of the videotaped discussions. The legitimation coding scheme will be used to code the typed dialogue. The responses will be summarized according to their frequency of occurrence in each of the 24 legitimation categories. Where frequencies are sufficient to permit, chi-square analysis of frequencies across the 3 groups will be performed. Due to low frequencies in some categories it may be necessary to combine certain categories for analysis.

4a) Within each of the groups, there will be differences in the frequencies within the legitimation categories on the pre and post-test of the historical facts quiz.

Coding and Analysis: Using the frequencies obtained from the coded responses, the difference between the pre and post test frequencies on the historical facts quiz will be computed for each of the 24 legitimation categories. For each group separately, the Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test will be performed comparing the pre-test frequency with the post-test frequency.

4b) There will be differences among the three groups in the amount of change in the frequencies within the legitimation categories on the pre and post test of the historical facts quiz.

Analysis: A nonparametric analysis of variance will be performed using the change in frequencies from the pre to post test as determined by the coded responses in each of the legitimation categories for the historical facts quiz.

5a) Within each group, there will be differences in the frequencies within the legitimation categories from the morning to afternoon large group discussion.

Analysis: For each group separately, the Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test will be performed comparing the pre-test frequency with the post-test frequency as determined by the coded responses in each of the legitimation categories.

5b) There will be differences among the three groups in the amount of change in the frequencies within the legitimation categories from the morning to afternoon large group discussions.

Analysis: A nonparametric analysis of variance will be performed using the change in frequencies from the morning to the afternoon discussions as determined by the coded responses in each of the legitimation categories.

6) There will be a relationship between racial attitude scores and change in the frequency of racist (delegitimizing) expressions on the pre and post-test of the historical facts quiz.

6) (continued)

Coding: A racial attitude score is obtained for each individual. On the historical facts quiz, the responses of each participant are coded according to the legitimation coding scheme on both the pre and post test. Each individual's change in frequency from pre to post will be determined for the historical facts quiz.

Analysis: A correlational analysis will be computed between change in frequency scores and racial attitude scores. This analysis will be performed for each group separately.

7) There will be a relationship between racial attitude scores and change in the frequency of racist (delegitimizing) expressions from the morning to afternoon large group discussions.

Coding: A racial attitude score is obtained for each individual. The responses of each participant is coded according to the legitimation coding scheme for both the morning and afternoon discussions. Each individual's change in frequency from the morning to afternoon discussion will be determined for each legitimation category.

Analysis: A correlational analysis will be computed between the change in frequency scores and racial attitude score. This analysis will be performed for each group separately.

8) There will be a relationship between the coded behavior which are revealed by the Urban Institute for Human Services, Inc. analysis and the evaluation of those same behaviors by independent anthropologists and clinical psychologists.

Analysis: Four expert consultants, one Black and one White anthropologist and one Black and one White psychologist, will be provided with a theoretical rationale of the UIHS inter-ethnic relations study. Using the theoretical rationale as a framework, the consultant will be asked to analyze and interpret the data according to their respective disciplines. Each consultant will analyze the data independently. The assumption is that the analyses will be similar although the disciplinary perspectives are different. The qualitative analyses

of the consultants will be compared with each other and with the quantitative analyses specified in the preceding hypotheses.

Procedures

Design

The design for the inter-ethnic relations study is a three group pre-post test design. The independent variables are the race of the subjects and the race relations training intervention, the "Return to the Source" slide presentation. The dependent variables are the measures of racial attitudes, historical racial information and racially legitimizing and delegitimizing behaviors. The three groups will consist of 1) an all Black group; 2) an all White group; and 3) a mixed group of Black and White subjects. Each group will receive the same treatment, i.e. race relations training. The research design is diagrammed below:

Racial Composition of Workshops

All Black N=15	All White N=15	Mixed (Black & White) N=15
Background Information Sheet Attitude Scale Historical Facts Quiz (pre-test) Large Group Discussion I	Slide Tape Presentation "Return to the Source"	Historical Facts Quiz (post) Large Group Discussion II Workshop Evaluation

Selection of Subjects

A total of 45 adults (23 Black and 22 White) from the metropolitan Bay Area will be selected for participation in the study. Subjects will be evenly distributed on sex. Community and university personnel will be contacted for subject referrals. Subjects will be assigned to the workshops based on their racial identification. Since one of the study's assumption is that racist behavior exists and is observable in all strata of American society, race becomes the critical variable in the selection of subjects.

Instrumentation

A. Instruments completed by participants

There are four written instruments which the participants complete individually.

Background Information Sheet

This is a demographic data sheet which includes the following items: respondent's sex, age, marital status, ethnicity, educational and occupational level, and previous race relations experience.

Attitude Scale "Identification with the Underdog"

This 11-item attitude scale was developed by Schuman and Harding (1963) to measure an individual's degree of empathy with different ethnic groups. The scale consists of eleven hypothetical situations where the respondent selects one of 4 possible choices regarding the main character's reaction in the story.

Historical Facts Quiz

This is a pre- and post-test developed by Hilliard (1973) to measure 1) the kind and degree of information, attitudes, and feelings regarding African peoples past and present and 2) the effect of the slide presentation. The historical facts quiz which consists of 11 slides is administered before and after the slide presentation. Each slide is projected on a screen for three minutes during which the respondents answer two open-ended questions.

Evaluation Form

This form is completed by the respondent at the end of the workshop to evaluate the overall and individual effectiveness of the various workshop components.

B. Data Coded by Coders

Both the written responses to the pre and post-test historical facts quiz and the typed transcripts of the two large group discussions will be coded by trained coders according to the legitimation coding scheme (see page) developed by the Urban Institute staff.

Data Collection

After prospective participants have been identified, letters will be sent explaining the purpose and objectives of the study and the workshop format. A request for participation form will be included for the individual to complete and return to the Urban Institute

Legitimation Theory Coding Scheme

	LEGITIMATION	NEUTRAL	DELEGITIMATION
Recognition	Respect Toward own racial/ethnic group By Toward other racial/ethnic group By	Knowledge/No feeling Toward own racial/ethnic group By Toward other racial/ethnic group By	Disrespect Toward own racial/ethnic group By Toward other racial/ethnic group By
Non-Recognition		No Knowledge/No Feeling Toward own racial/ethnic group By Toward other racial/ethnic group By	Transformation Toward own racial/ethnic group By Toward other racial/ethnic group By
			Denial Toward own racial/ethnic group By Toward other racial/ethnic group By

office indicating whether or not (s)he will participate.

A list of participants will be compiled. Participants will be assigned to the workshops based on their race and sex. Prior to each workshop, follow-up phone calls will be made to confirm participation.

The data for the study will be collected during the workshops. Each participant will receive a workshop packet which includes the workshop agenda and the four participant forms (background information sheet, attitude scale, pre and post historical facts quiz and the workshop evaluation).

At the beginning of the workshop, the participants will fill out the background information sheet. Then Dr. Asa Hilliard will greet the participants and make the introductory remarks. This will be followed by the participants' completion of the racial attitude scale. After the attitude scale, the pre-test of the historical facts quiz will be administered. Each of the eleven slides will be displayed on the screen for three minutes with a 30 second warning before the presentation of the next slide. During the 3-minute interval the participants write their response to two open-ended questions. The historical facts quiz slides are not included in the "Return to the Source" slide presentation.

The morning large group discussion opens with the first half (30 minutes) of the film "Where is Prejudice?" This film is the stimulus for the morning discussion. "Where is Prejudice?" was made in 1968 and is an intensive study of twelve middle-class students' common avowal that they are not prejudiced. Prejudice and racist attitudes and behaviors emerge and are clearly evident in the film. This film is an

excellent vehicle for discussing racism then and now. Are there changes or differences? After the film, there is a one hour discussion facilitated by the Urban Institute staff. The discussion is videotaped by two experienced video technicians. The large group discussion concludes the morning session.

The afternoon session begins with the slide tape presentation "Return to the Source". Immediately following is the post-test of the historical facts quiz which is administered the same as the pre-test. After the historical facts quiz is the afternoon group discussion facilitated by the project's principal investigator. The purpose of this discussion is to elicit reactions, questions and responses to the slide presentation and to observe change in behaviors regarding race. The completion of the workshop evaluation form concludes the workshop.

The following is the workshop agenda:

9:00 - 9:30	Background Information Sheet Morning Refreshments
9:30 - 10:00	Greetings and Introduction by Asa G. Hilliard
10:00 - 10:30	Historical Facts Quiz
10:30 - 10:45	Attitude Scale
10:45 - 12:30	Large Group Discussion I
12:30 - 1:30	L U N C H
1:30 - 2:30	Slide Presentation
2:30 - 3:00	Historical Facts Quiz
3:00 - 4:15	Large Group Discussion II
4:15 - 4:30	Workshop Evaluation

Data Analysis

An analysis of variance will be used to examine group differences in terms of background, racial attitudes, and type and frequency of racial information and racial legitimation/delegitimation behaviors. Differences in the pre and post responses on the historical facts quiz and the large group discussions within and between the groups will be examined by analysis of covariance. Correlational analysis will be performed to look at relationships between background variables, racial attitudes and difference scores on the pre and post measures within the three groups. A discriminant function analysis is the technique that will be used to identify background predictors of racial attitude and racial legitimation/delegitimation behaviors.

Video tapes will be analyzed by two sociolinguists and two clinical psychologists who will be informed about the legitimation-delegitimation construct. They will not be given information about the Urban Institute for Human Services, Inc. instruments for measuring the behaviors. These professional practitioners will not be members of the project staff. They will be asked to make individual independent analyses of approximately six hours of video tapes. The professionals will be asked to use their own tools to determine if legitimation-delegitimation behaviors occur. Each professional will write a report with examples to document their conclusions.

REFERENCES

Hare, A. Paul Handbook of Small Group Research. New York: The Free Press, 1962.

Hare, A. Paul, Borgatta, Edgar F. and Bales, Robert F. Small Groups. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1965.

McGrath, Joseph E. and Altman, Irwin Small Group Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1966.

APPENDICES

I.D.# 01

Date: 7/29/78

EVALUATION FORM

1. Rate the overall workshop

(1)Excellent___ (2)Very Good X (3)Good___ (4)Fair___ (5)Poor___ (6)Very Poor___

2. Rate each of the workshop activities from 1 to 5, where 1 = "most interesting" and 5 = "least interesting".

Attitude Survey 5
Small Group Task 2
Historical Facts Quiz 3
Slide Presentation 1
Large Group Discussion 4

3. What were the most beneficial aspects of the workshop?

Being in contact with different people and opinions and the education that brings.

4. What were the least beneficial aspects of the workshop?

Workshops of this type are not as long as could be.

5. What impact did the workshop have on you?

(1) Very positive impact ____ (2) Positive impact ____ (3) Somewhat positive impact ____

(4) Negative impact ____ (5) Very negative impact ____ (6) No impact ____

Explain:

6. Would you make any changes in either the workshop format or content?

Yes X No ____

If yes, what changes would you make?

Do away with the surveys. Extend informational presentations , then also the periods of discussion.

7. Did the workshop change you in any way? Yes X No ____

If yes, how?

To continually seek out the truth in people and situations.

I.D.# 02

Date: 7/29/78

EVALUATION FORM

1. Rate the overall workshop

(1)Excellent___ (2)Very Good__X__ (3)Good___ (4)Fair___ (5)Poor___ (6)Very Poor___

2. Rate each of the workshop activities from 1 to 5, where 1 = "most interesting" and 5 = "least interesting".

Attitude Survey 4
Small Group Task 4
Historical Facts Quiz 3
Slide Presentation 1
Large Group Discussion 2

3. What were the most beneficial aspects of the workshop?

The film and the large group discussion

4. What were the least beneficial aspects of the workshop?

The Bakke discussions and the small group rating questionnaire.

5. What impact did the workshop have on you?

(1) Very positive impact X
(2) Positive impact ____
(3) Somewhat positive impact ____
(4) Negative impact ____
(5) Very negative impact ____
(6) No impact ____

Explain:

It opened me up to a different way of looking at things. It has made me conscious of my lack of knowledge.

6. Would you make any changes in either the workshop format or content?

Yes X No _____

If yes, what changes would you make?

Less paperwork.

7. Did the workshop change you in any way? Yes X No _____

If yes, how?

Perhaps. It has opened up that possibility.

I.D.# 03

Date: 7-29-78

EVALUATION FORM

1. Rate the overall workshop

(1)Excellent X (2)Very Good ___ (3)Good ___ (4)Fair ___ (5)Poor ___ (6)Very Poor ___

2. Rate each of the workshop activities from 1 to 5, where 1 = "most interesting" and 5 = "least interesting".

Attitude Survey 3
Small Group Task 1
Historical Facts Quiz 5
Slide Presentation 1
Large Group Discussion 1

3. What were the most beneficial aspects of the workshop?

Meeting the other people and listening to their views.

4. What were the least beneficial aspects of the workshop?

5. What impact did the workshop have on you?

(1) Very positive impact X (2) Positive impact ___ (3) Somewhat positive impact ___

(4) Negative impact ___ (5) Very negative impact ___ (6) No impact ___

Explain:

6. Would you make any changes in either the workshop format or content?

Yes ___ No X

If yes, what changes would you make?

7. Did the workshop change you in any way? Yes ___ No ___

If yes, how?

? I need time to think about it.

I.D.# 04

Date: 7/29/78

EVALUATION FORM

1. Rate the overall workshop

(1)Excellent___ (2)Very Good X (3)Good___ (4)Fair___ (5)Poor___ (6)Very Poor___

2. Rate each of the workshop activities from 1 to 5, where 1 = "most interesting" and 5 = "least interesting".

Attitude Survey 5
Small Group Task 3
Historical Facts Quiz 2
Slide Presentation 1
Large Group Discussion 2

3. What were the most beneficial aspects of the workshop?

The group discussions.

4. What were the least beneficial aspects of the workshop?

Not enough variety--re. discussion of groups other than Blacks.

5. What impact did the workshop have on you?

(1) Very positive impact ____ (2) Positive impact X (3) Somewhat positive impact ____

(4) Negative impact ____ (5) Very negative impact ____ (6) No impact ____

Explain:

I felt that some people held back.

6. Would you make any changes in either the workshop format or content?

Yes X No _____

If yes, what changes would you make?

Arrange for a more diversified discussion group--include some people who might cause conflict.

7. Did the workshop change you in any way? Yes X No _____

If yes, how?

Deep down inside, I still have many hangups and perhaps I relate to only those people I can communicate best with. I don't know if this is good or bad though.

I.D.# 05

Date: 7/29/78

EVALUATION FORM

1. Rate the overall workshop

(1)Excellent___ (2)Very Good X (3)Good___ (4)Fair___ (5)Poor___ (6)Very Poor___

2. Rate each of the workshop activities from 1 to 5, where 1 = "most interesting" and 5 = "least interesting".

Attitude Survey 5
Small Group Task 3
Historical Facts Quiz 4
Slide Presentation 1
Large Group Discussion 2

3. What were the most beneficial aspects of the workshop?

1. Increasing my awareness of background information regarding Negro history.
2. Learning more about how another group thinks.

4. What were the least beneficial aspects of the workshop?

Attitude surveys.

5. What impact did the workshop have on you?

(1) Very positive impact ____ (2) Positive impact X (3) Somewhat positive impact ____

(4) Negative impact ____ (5) Very negative impact ____ (6) No impact ____

Explain:

Feel somewhat frustrated, tho', in area of how the slides and available information will benefit the Navy in getting Caucasians to be more understanding if you do your workshop on largely black participants.

6. Would you make any changes in either the workshop format or content?

Yes X No ____

If yes, what changes would you make?

I would have felt more comfortable if the "leadership" had broadened participation from the silent bodies during large group discussion.

7. Did the workshop change you in any way? Yes X No ____

If yes, how?

I hope I have learned by listening and become more understanding by awareness.

I.D.# 5

Date: 7/_0/78

EVALUATION FORM

1. Rate the overall workshop

(1)Excellent___ (2)Good X (3)Good___ (4)Fair___ (5)Poor___ (6)Very Poor___

2. Rate each of the workshop activities from 1 to 5, where 1 = "most interesting" and 5 = "least interesting".

Attitude Survey 5
Small Group Task 2
Historical Facts Quiz 2
Slide Presentation 1
Large Group Discussion 1

3. What were the most beneficial aspects of the workshop?

The slides.

4. What were the least beneficial aspects of the workshop?

The Bakke Case debate.

5. What impact did the workshop have on you?

(1) Very positive impact ____ (2) Positive impact X (3) Somewhat positive impact ____

(4) Negative impact ____ (5) Very negative impact ____ (6) No impact ____

Explain:

I will immediately make some of the information from the slides available to our children.

6. Would you make any changes in either the workshop format or content?

Yes X No _____

If yes, what changes would you make?

Less writing and more discussion

7. Did the workshop change you in any way? Yes X No _____

If yes, how?

I feel that being Black is even more beautiful.

I.D.# 07

Date: 7/29/78

EVALUATION FORM

1. Rate the overall workshop

(1)Excellent___ (2)Very Good X (3)Good___ (4)Fair___ (5)Poor___ (6)Very Poor___

2. Rate each of the workshop activities from 1 to 5, where 1 = "most interesting" and 5 = "least interesting".

Attitude Survey 4
Small Group Task 3
Historical Facts Quiz 5
Slide Presentation 1
Large Group Discussion 2

3. What were the most beneficial aspects of the workshop?

The interchange and intergroup action.

4. What were the least beneficial aspects of the workshop?

The rating of each other.

5. What impact did the workshop have on you?

(1) Very positive impact X (2) Positive impact ____ (3) Somewhat positive impact ____

(4) Negative impact ____ (5) Very negative impact ____ (6) No impact ____

Explain:

6. Would you make any changes in either the workshop format or content?

Yes ____ No X

If yes, what changes would you make?

7. Did the workshop change you in any way? Yes ____ No X

If yes, how?

I.D.# 08

Date: 7/29/78

EVALUATION FORM

1. Rate the overall workshop

(1)Excellent X (2)Very Good ___ (3)Good ___ (4)Fair ___ (5)Poor ___ (6)Very Poor ___

2. Rate each of the workshop activities from 1 to 5, where 1 = "most interesting" and 5 = "least interesting".

Attitude Survey 5
Small Group Task 2
Historical Facts Quiz 4
Slide Presentation 1
Large Group Discussion 3

3. What were the most beneficial aspects of the workshop?

Interchanges of ideas -- opinions -- a sense of. Let's get on with the job.

4. What were the least beneficial aspects of the workshop?

Forms -- necessary but a dull job.

5. What impact did the workshop have on you?

(1) Very positive impact X (2) Positive impact ___ (3) Somewhat positive impact ___

(4) Negative impact ___ (5) Very negative impact ___ (6) No impact ___

Explain:

An awareness of great need to deal with facts and to correct mis-conceptions, etc.

6. Would you make any changes in either the workshop format or content?

Yes ___ No X

If yes, what changes would you make?

7. Did the workshop change you in any way? Yes X No ___

If yes, how?

More sensitivity to questioning purported "Facts".

I.D.# 09

Date: 7/29/78

EVALUATION FORM

1. Rate the overall workshop

(1)Excellent X (2)Good ___ (3)Good ___ (4)Fair ___ (5)Poor ___ (6)Very Poor ___

2. Rate each of the workshop activities from 1 to 5, where 1 = "most interesting" and 5 = "least interesting".

Attitude Survey 3
Small Group Task 1
Historical Facts Quiz 4
Slide Presentation 1
Large Group Discussion 1

3. What were the most beneficial aspects of the workshop?

inter-group communication, slide show and discussion
*excellent staff

4. What were the least beneficial aspects of the workshop?

attitude survey

5. What impact did the workshop have on you?

(1) Very positive impact X (2) Positive impact ___ (3) Somewhat positive impact ___

(4) Negative impact ___ (5) Very negative impact ___ (6) No impact ___

Explain: Am interested in race relations. Learned a lot, met some real good people.

6. Would you make any changes in either the workshop format or content?

Yes X No ___

If yes, what changes would you make?

Better lunch, better attitude survey, more Chicanos, Asians, etc.
Facilitator needed for group dynamics when it's monopolized.

7. Did the workshop change you in any way? Yes X No ___

If yes, how? Learned.

I.D.# 10

Date: 7/29/78

EVALUATION FORM

1. Rate the overall workshop

(1)Excellent X (2)Very Good ___ (3)Good ___ (4)Fair ___ (5)Poor ___ (6)Very Poor ___

2. Rate each of the workshop activities from 1 to 5, where 1 = "most interesting" and 5 = "least interesting".

Attitude Survey 4
Small Group Task 5
Historical Facts Quiz 5
Slide Presentation 5
Large Group Discussion 5

3. What were the most beneficial aspects of the workshop?

Slide show and discussion.

4. What were the least beneficial aspects of the workshop?

Filling out forms.

5. What impact did the workshop have on you?

(1) Very positive impact X
(2) Positive impact ___
(3) Somewhat positive impact ___
(4) Negative impact ___
(5) Very negative impact ___
(6) No impact ___

Explain:

Learn about something that I never knew about.

6. Would you make any changes in either the workshop format or content?

Yes ___ No X

If yes, what changes would you make?

7. Did the workshop change you in any way? Yes X No ___

If yes, how?

Made me more aware of Pan Africanism.

I.D.# 11

Date: 7-29-78

EVALUATION FORM

1. Rate the overall workshop

(1)Excellent X (2)Very Good ___ (3)Good ___ (4)Fair ___ (5)Poor ___ (6)Very Poor ___

2. Rate each of the workshop activities from 1 to 5, where 1 = "most interesting" and 5 = "least interesting".

Attitude Survey 4
Small Group Task 4
Historical Facts Quiz 5
Slide Presentation 5
Large Group Discussion 5

3. What were the most beneficial aspects of the workshop?

The slides

4. What were the least beneficial aspects of the workshop?

Answering questionnaires

5. What impact did the workshop have on you?

(1) Very positive impact X (2) Positive impact ___ (3) Somewhat positive impact ___

(4) Negative impact ___ (5) Very negative impact ___ (6) No impact ___

Explain:

6. Would you make any changes in either the workshop format or content?

Yes ___ No X

If yes, what changes would you make?

7. Did the workshop change you in any way? Yes X No ___

If yes, how?

It made me more aware of my background.

I.D.# 12

Date: 7/29/78

EVALUATION FORM

1. Rate the overall workshop

(1)Excellent___ (2)Very Good X (3)Good___ (4)Fair___ (5)Poor___ (6)Very Poor___

2. Rate each of the workshop activities from 1 to 5, where 1 = "most interesting" and 5 = "least interesting".

Attitude Survey 5
Small Group Task 2
Historical Facts Quiz 4
Slide Presentation 1
Large Group Discussion 3

3. What were the most beneficial aspects of the workshop?

To see how others deal with their experiences.

4. What were the least beneficial aspects of the workshop?

None.

5. What impact did the workshop have on you?

(1) Very positive impact X (2) Positive impact ____ (3) Somewhat positive impact ____

(4) Negative impact ____ (5) Very negative impact ____ (6) No impact ____

Explain:

The experience of being with a number of interesting people and learning something at the same time.

6. Would you make any changes in either the workshop format or content?

Yes X No ____

If yes, what changes would you make?

More discussion and less writting.

7. Did the workshop change you in any way? Yes ____ No X

If yes, how?

I.D.# 14

Date: 7/29/78

EVALUATION FORM

1. Rate the overall workshop

(1)Excellent X (2)Very Good ___ (3)Good ___ (4)Fair ___ (5)Poor ___ (6)Very Poor ___

2. Rate each of the workshop activities from 1 to 5, where 1 = "most interesting" and 5 = "least interesting".

Attitude Survey 5
Small Group Task 4
Historical Facts Quiz 3
Slide Presentation 2
Large Group Discussion 1

3. What were the most beneficial aspects of the workshop?

Large Group Discussion

4. What were the least beneficial aspects of the workshop?

The rating which we refused to do.

5. What impact did the workshop have on you?

(1) Very positive impact ____ (2) Positive impact X (3) Somewhat positive impact ____

(4) Negative impact ____ (5) Very negative impact ____ (6) No impact ____

Explain: Found the slides very interesting especially the sphinx and the Black Madonna because I didn't know about these. Found the large group discussion good. Also found the small group discussion good!

6. Would you make any changes in either the workshop format or content?

Yes ____ No ____ Hard to say because we don't know what the reasons were behind the format.

If yes, what changes would you make?

7. Did the workshop change you in any way? Yes ____ No X

If yes, how?

I suppose mostly because I've done a lot of similar things, but maybe it changed me and I just haven't perceived it yet.

I.D.# 15

Date: 7/29/78

EVALUATION FORM

1. Rate the overall workshop

(1)Excellent___ (2)Very Good____ (3)Good X (4)Fair___ (5)Poor___ (6)Very Poor___

2. Rate each of the workshop activities from 1 to 5, where 1 = "most interesting" and 5 = "least interesting".

Attitude Survey 5
Small Group Task 2
Historical Facts Quiz 2
Slide Presentation 1
Large Group Discussion 2

3. What were the most beneficial aspects of the workshop?

Slide presentation -- willingness of participants

4. What were the least beneficial aspects of the workshop?

N/A

5. What impact did the workshop have on you?

(1) Very positive impact X
(2) Positive impact ____
(3) Somewhat positive impact ____
(4) Negative impact ____
(5) Very negative impact ____
(6) No impact ____

Explain:

See #7

6. Would you make any changes in either the workshop format or content?

Yes X No _____

If yes, what changes would you make?

a. - include more ethnic groups
b. - expand content of slides to include other groups

7. Did the workshop change you in any way? Yes X No _____

If yes, how?

Reminded and reinforced the idea that there are people who care, and are willing to work on the changing of attitudes and the dissemination of ideas.

I.D.# 17

Date: 7-29-78

EVALUATION FORM

1. Rate the overall workshop

(1)Excellent X (2)Very Good ___ (3)Good ___ (4)Fair ___ (5)Poor ___ (6)Very Poor ___

2. Rate each of the workshop activities from 1 to 5, where 1 = "most interesting" and 5 = "least interesting".

Attitude Survey 2
Small Group Task 1
Historical Facts Quiz 2
Slide Presentation 1
Large Group Discussion 1

3. What were the most beneficial aspects of the workshop?

4. What were the least beneficial aspects of the workshop?

5. What impact did the workshop have on you?

(1) Very positive impact ____ (2) Positive impact ____ (3) Somewhat positive impact ____

(4) Negative impact ____ (5) Very negative impact ____ (6) No impact ____

Explain:

Meeting very interesting people who have a common denominator.
Putting new information into the classroom.

6. Would you make any changes in either the workshop format or content?

Yes X No ____

If yes, what changes would you make?

More discussion; question and asking after the slide presentation so that the new information can be absorbed more thoroughly.

7. Did the workshop change you in any way? Yes X No ____

If yes, how?

It presented new material.

I.D.# 19

Date: 7/29/78

EVALUATION FORM

1. Rate the overall workshop

(1)Excellent X (2)Very Good ___ (3)Good ___ (4)Fair ___ (5)Poor ___ (6)Very Poor ___

2. Rate each of the workshop activities from 1 to 5, where 1 = "most interesting" and 5 = "least interesting".

Attitude Survey 2
Small Group Task 1
Historical Facts Quiz 1
Slide Presentation 1
Large Group Discussion 1

3. What were the most beneficial aspects of the workshop?

Group discussion and slide presentation.

4. What were the least beneficial aspects of the workshop?

Attitude survey could have been updated.

5. What impact did the workshop have on you?

(1) Very positive impact X (2) Positive impact ___ (3) Somewhat positive impact ___

(4) Negative impact ___ (5) Very negative impact ___ (6) No impact ___

Explain:

Very informative

6. Would you make any changes in either the workshop format or content?

Yes ___ No X

If yes, what changes would you make?

7. Did the workshop change you in any way? Yes X No ___

If yes, how?

Reinforced ideas and educated me to facts I was not aware of. I also got to meet some very good people.

SMALL GROUP TASK

14: You can't be on the side you believe in.

02: . . . I'm not rational at all about this (my emotions--I'm sorry I'm not rational at all).

14: The Baake case makes me see green, red and purple. There are some real interesting implications. For a while I thought there was really a Baake case, but you know there really wasn't. Then I realized it was a set up. They would have set up someone else.

02: Why not, it was just an excuse. You should not prejudice yourself. You have to be clear minded and precise.

14: Yeah, but everybody knows that it is not going to be like that. It was a set up. Yes, it was definitely a conspiracy. Lenny Bruce said that if you're not being paranoid means you're not paying attention, and I love that statement, it's one I carry with me. So, 02 you're paying attention, that's all.

20: The group is on its own.

14: Oh, you mean you're not supervising us? Everybody give brief descriptions of themselves.

10: My name is _____ and as I said earlier I'm from Oakland. My main interests is acting and internal relationships. I am a student from San Francisco State University in B. Ed.

02: My name is _____ and I am a native of New York. I came here two years ago and I'm not a professional.

04: Everybody is a professional.

02: Well, I'm a professional nonprofessional.

18: My name is _____ and I'm also a housewife and mother of six children. I work at North-East Mental Health and I have a masters from San Francisco State.

04: My name is _____ and I live in San Francisco and work at U.C. Medical Center. I recently completed a masters in Public Administration.

12: My name is _____ and I live and work in Pacifica. I teach third grade. I'm also working on a masters in Public Administration.

08: I'm _____ and I live in Pacifica. I'm a father, government watcher, I have a handcraft shop, I do a lot of volunteer work and fundraising.

06: I'm_____ and I was born in Tuskegee Alabama. I came to California twenty years ago, and have been teaching in Vallejo since 1959 off and on. I have been on sick leave for the last 2 years.

14: I'm _____ and I was born in Cleveland but raised in New York City. I came out here three years ago. I'm sometimes a teacher and a writer. I got Jarvis-Ganned so I'm typing for 40 hours a day and doing consultations at night to pay the rent. I have a 16 year old son . . . I spent 10 years in Florida. My roots are in the south. We need to do something pertaining to dividing into groups.

02: We'll toss coins.

10: Two's choose. Group divides.

08: Go around the table every other one to see who calls.

THE GROUPS DIVIDED TO DISCUSS BAAKE.

02: Am I a 1 or 2?

10: You're a 2.

14: 1, 2, 1, 2, you're a 1.

THE TWO GROUPS (Pro and Con Baake) ARE TALKING AT ONCE: HERE ARE A FEW COMMENTS.

18: Discusses having money to go to school.
I have a feeling he may not go to med school.

06: Baake's grades weren't that good, I understand.

12: Telling about a woman in her 30s, she wouldn't want to go to a doctor who had "C" grades as opposed to As and Bs.

18: It's not necessarily having a C, but how much you care for people.

14: People should be awarded for long service, the merit system (pro Baake).

12: I guess we have decided why special admission programs were constitutional. I guess the big issue is numbers, right?

12: The majority is still numbers. We are a minority because of numbers.

06: But fewer Blacks are admitted. We are interested in the Blacks admitted.

12: Well, there are fewer Blacks in the first place, therefore, it seems the numbers is the first factor in the issue.

06: It has something to do with background. Money, importance, we were not important until we were brought to this country. The education, background, . . . Some consideration and the best qualified. We all go through the Black minority thing.

18: Pertinent comments on Proposition 13.

14: Hey, folks we're late, I think so because we're supposed to plan a negotiation because 04 just read about the negotiation plan. We haven't even gotten to presentation and position statements. We have to debate for (25) minutes and for (30) minutes we have to plan negotiation. We're late!

06: Well, I think these negotiations won't take (30) minutes.

02: We should have gotten somebody from the American Nazi party if we wanted a controlled group.

12 to 10: You'll be the speaker for our group.

12: We talked about numbers. It's not a Black-White situation. Being a doctor . . . is it all involving money?

06: The man (Baake) applied where he wanted to go.

10: Also you must consider the qualifications of a person like Baake getting into medical school. Why did he attack those sixteen slots. Why didn't he attack those other two schools he was turned down from. Why wasn't UC Davis in those sixteen slots. He didn't attack those fellow students who had less grade point averages. He didn't attack them. He decided that it was a minority spot that was holding him from medical school. And is Baake as a graduate from medical school going to go out into the minority community and work? Most likely not. Most minority doctors who do graduate from medical school do go to work in the minority community, because a lot of white people don't want to go to them which is another reason it is constitutional. You need doctors in the minority community. You don't need all the hogging into the cities trying to make all the big bucks anyway. And since we started off far behind we need those special admissions

10: continued.

programs to catch up. Until that day happens, special admissions programs will not be unconstitutional in our view.

14: Okay, I'm presenting the opposite point of view. These minority women are talking over all the things that have always been in the man's say and they have always been in our hands. People are being ridiculous today, they just want power. One of the things is I used hoe corn when I was a boy in Nebraska and now you see I'm a senator and I've come a long way and I've done it all by myself with the help of the church. And the Protestant work ethic. Well, the Protestant work ethic is what this country has been built upon and you see we don't have too many communists yet. Although they're around all the time. Now, many people don't understand that the communists were behind the civil rights movement and there was this women's movement; the communists have decided to turn all women into loving women and you watch this, this will happen. The Baake case, this is our last stand see. Trying to get a few white doctors in (well-qualified) people that the well qualified man. Illegal aliens are coming in from the south border taking over American's jobs. We are working on a patrol for that. Now I know a person at the phone company who came up for promotion fourteen times and a woman and a minority person got it every time. This man has been with the phone company twenty-two years, he has a wife and family (and he used to hoe corn with me). Now, why should this man (Baake) decide to be sacrificed for social ends? You know what that means, we'll end up like communist China. That's what Castro did--sacrificed for social ends and they're all over here now taking our jobs. The Cubans. America has had an open door policy for too long. America needs to close its doors, we have our own problems here. And most of them are the people with this affirmative action business. Now the quota system, you see this is trying to force in people who are incompete as doctors, lawyers, to let them come in and have these licenses to go around butchering people. Doctors are bad enough as it is, let these people in and its going to be worst. Baake's civil rights were violated. He had civil rights too, right? He is a white male with civil rights. He had a right to get into graduate school and he didn't get it. He deserves to be there, he had a good score and a good score is what this country wants. If you get a good score on a test you know you are doing alright. How else can we judge people if we don't have IQ tests and good scores and how can you judge someone. If minorities and women already qualify they would be doctors and lawyers. If God had meant them to be doctors and lawyers they would be that right now. And they would be getting good scores too. The minorities

14: continued.

had all the great social programs. If they hadn't gotten there by then they are not going to get there. All those presidents; Kennedy, you see what happened to him, he was trying all those programs that were not appropriate. Martin Luther King, all those people in the sixties, they tried those programs and you see if women and minorities had been meant to get there they would already be there. The only way to get there is by your own boot straps pulling yourself up. Thank you.

12: That was beautiful!

06: That was . . . I've heard that before!

02: We can talk but there's really nothing to talk about. Now we have to debate . . . But there's nothing to debate about.

14: We dummied the argument up . . . but we can talk.

10: But we got to do a good job.

02: You're just wasting time talking.

12: Is there any way that that kind of thinking can be changed?

14: The negotiation would revolve around the question to destroy the seniority system or not! There should be some kind of way to destroy the seniority system. . . . That's what I got from my student who . . .

02: I don't think it has to be either, or I think the government is using this as a ploy to alienate people. You can have affirmative action and seniority, the government just has to put more money into the effort.

14: That sounds good!

10: The government is not putting a lot into getting people in becoming doctors.

02: The priorities of this country are economic rather than humane.

18: And first, people have got to have the money . . . they wouldn't let Black doctors in hospitals (so they were limited) had to just starve in the Black community. . . . It's a game--everyone going around in circles and no one is winning.

14: Okay. Let's get back to 02's issue

10: Are we saying open admissions?

02: Not only open admissions but remedial programs.

10: . . . Require that doctors have to serve 2 years after graduation in underserved . . .

08: What bothers him is this tracking everyone off into specializations. We're just gerrymandering, we need more place!

02: I think that we have too many specialists in the medical field. I'd like to find just one to do everything.

12: What really bothers me is that the children of tomorrow--the Baake decision puts it up on this high pedestal out of reach. The little boy in the cotton field can't make it because its too far to reach; it should be within reach.

18: Being a doctor should be a service position (You're a servant of the community).

14: It appears that with a lot of doctors--I haven't taken a survey of doctors--that they have gone for the fat salaries and lost the larger sense of being some kind of humanitarian in a service position. And I think a lot of service professions have lost the sense of service. That is the reason our society is in such a terrible shape.

12: It goes back to how you want to live and how well you want to live.

14: A lot of these doctors want to live very high.

08: The system.

12: Well, where did they come from in the first place?

08: The whole issue is economic. Before Medi-Cal and Medi-Care doctors were more willing to give service because many people could not afford medical care. As soon as money became available doctor's would not give five cents of their time free.

12: But you wouldn't want to see it taken away.

18: The doctor should be at a standard salary like your salary . . . In the south there's no Medicare.

02: I think the fundamental question is--is everybody entitled to medical care. We all have bodies. It's the common denominator. It's human being and they all break down, and the medical profession is about healing all bodies! It shouldn't be economic.

04: I work with doctors, they need to get paid back for loans, etc.

02: The economic factors represent a mentality and attitude. Well, if the big money is there why not get it.

10: The doctors have to pay back loans.

08: San Francisco Medicare only takes a small amount of those who apply.

06: Doctors are under tremendous pressure. Statistics etc. show that they are under pressure (Statistics on Alcoholism).

18: They put themselves under that pressure.

02: I think it has something to do with those sixteen slots.

06: Not only that, but after they get into those schools, they have tremendous pressure.

12: They aspire to be God cause if you're God you got to produce.

06: I think it is opening the eyes of the youth as to whether this is really the profession they want to go into. Our son wanted medicine until the Baake thing--now he's thinking about the problems involved instead of the money of being a doctor (he's rethinking his decision).

04: I see a lot more women in the medical profession and I think that will add more sensitivity to it.

02: I think it will lower the pay scale.

04: Do you think they can stand the pressure?

06: Have you ever had to stay home with kids . . . and hold a full time job, etc.?

12: When talking about families, especially the Black family where the mother is the head of the household because the father can't get a job. There was also the element of the grandmother there, the extended family concept there which we are losing it seems to me. When there was someone--the extended family--there to help in the guidance of the children, is there something to replace that?

18: The streets are there . . . kids pick models. If mother tells (teaches) them constructive things that help . . .

12: We see the problem. My question is what can we do to change it?

02: What do you provide as models when there are broken homes? How do you deal with apathy?

18: You've got to stimulate.

14: Go out and organize.

18: We decided we have to change the whole society.

12: So we need a community organizer.

02: You sound like one . . . maybe we'll get a national coalition here.

10: Not changing the subject, but did we finalize the . . . (arguments)?

14: As a white dance teacher with a Black dance company I have had problems from all sides all the time.

20: I hate to interrupt a good discussion but let me ask you where you are at this point.

02: Any point.

20: We would like you to evaluate the discussion and there's a form for you to fill out. I'll pass out the content examination.

14: Are you talking about the small group or the whole group?

20: The whole group.

12 & 06: I can't answer this. Oh no!

02: Here comes competitiveness. We were involved in this discussion.

04: Women doctors seem to be mainly ObGyn or Pediatrics.

02: They have been denied other spaces up until recently.

04: There will be an imbalance if women are not in cancer research, surgeons, etc.

14: Women are more in ObGyn because its been in men's hands so long. Just like Black doctors will be interested in sickle cell anemia because they want to see it cured because they have a vested interest.

08: (re: women as surgeons) That's mechanical. Women are not trained for mechanics.

02: Women go into what they're interested in.

06: When it comes to pressure . . . I could write you a book on it.

14: I have a friend across the street who's becoming an industrial engineer and that's what she wants to do . . . she did not pick it because she felt women ought to.

02: If you pick a profession because women ought to go into it, there's a flow in your motivation.

14: Good point!

18: Don't live your life according to someone else's expectations.

08: Have we finalized our check list?

14: We raised some good issues. In order to solve the problem preserving affirmative action and seniority we have to change the whole society.

06: The whole motivation in the first place for going into various professions--let it not be purely economic, maybe not economic at all. We also did not talk about how many of us went into professions because there was nothing else to go into.

02: That would be interesting!

06: Like teaching, nursing, the post office--particularly Blacks. We're prevented from entering other fields.

12: . . . Where you were directed by counselors and parents.

18: Counseling would benefit Blacks, people etc.

Small Group Task

06: We don't have to answer this.

14: Will we still get our $25.00?

20: Regardless.

14: People are going to get prejudiced against psychologists one of these days.

14: Suppose we don't do this at all. Let's take a vote.

02: These tests are a menace!

12: Let's take a vote as a group . . . everyone was dynamic.

14: The tenor of our discussion was that we didn't like the competitiveness of this society.

02: He probably did this just to get our reaction anyway.

14: I just can't do that.

20: On the content exam I have 11 pictures . . . Make comments. The pictures are numbered. After you finish reading, get ready for lunch.

02: This whole test is cold!

20: Keep track of your impressions . . . It'll be helpful to us later on in the evaluations.

Large Group Discussion

19: Well, the first thing is that the people who have seniority be complaining that after they put in all this time on the job, they're going to be replaced by a bunch of newcomers. I've run into some jobs myself--like I used to work in Lucky stores after I got out of high school back in 67 and it was one of those things where after a number of shop-ins . . . they decided to bring in minorities and women to work in the stores. At the home office it was nice and everything and they enjoyed it. But at the stores the employees felt the burden was misplaced or that these people would take over their jobs eventually and they would be in the cold. That led to a few problems.

05: Well, if you have seniority, you're essentially better qualified because you've been there longer so you know what to do, etc. right?

07: Well, that's basically true in private industry but what about civil service?

19: Yeah.

05: We have to assume it's true. We have to assume that if we've been there longer we know how to do it better, we know what the rules are.

15: He's thinking in terms of civil service.

07: I'm thinking in terms of jobs like IBM keypunch. Okay, this is a job where a affirmative action program for someone who has had 2 years experience as opposed to someone who has had 5 or 7 years experience. Supposedly the one with the 5 or 7 years experience is better qualified. This is the assumption we're making. But the job can be learned in six months. You reach your maximum ability, absorption or potential on that particular job in six months. Now, it reaches a point where it is saturated as far as ability, qualification is concerned . . . So, this is the question of whether the person with 5 or 6 years experience verses the new one with 6 months to a year experience. There has got to be some kind of fair way.

15: Are you also implying that it's possible that someone who got 2 years of experience for example, from 70-72, may have more information and the current information, than somebody working from 61 to 70?

07: That's true.

05: We have to think of the other side of the argument.

15: That's true.

05: . . . Seniority can only be used then--qualifications.

15: . . . the other plus for seniority.

07: . . . The case in point for seniority is that if the person is qualified for the job, in terms of economic gains for the company, if I were owner of the company, my main interests is in turning over profit, to make money. My stand would be I don't care if you're purple with polka dots. If you can produce the same product twice as fast as any human being, you could be a martian, I'll hire you.

15: So, then if you really are crippled, do I have to include the wheelchair and access to your job, and ramps and revamping the bathrooms and moving your table down so that you can reach it from your wheelchair. Aren't they going to cost you a lot of money?

07: I don't know, that would be extra capital expense that I as the company owner would have to put out.

15: So as long as my production overexceeds what it would cost for you to hire me, we're cool. Is that what you're saying?

07: Yeah. What I'm basically saying is the less overhead problem the better I'll be. Okay, how about the area of preferential irony where it invades into the area of seniority? Giving the students the understanding that this person is less qualified than say a cable splicer with ten years experience. We have to move in some telephone installers who have to be advanced to the positions of cable splicers. Okay, there is immediate rejection on the part of the senior cable splicers, the guy makes $20,000/year. . . It amounts to the minority person going into the seniority person's icebox in effect. Because what he is doing is stealing this person's paycheck, this is the feeling of the person. If you've got only so many going in, someone has to be moved. If the forced issue was 2 more positions had to be moved in . . . the reaction of the one moved is that he was going to get a gun and go out and shoot the "Nigger".

05: Is this because you have to increase your minorities, therefore, you're hiring more people to do the same job, what happens to the people that were there?

07: He has to be moved to another position of less paid, that's what happened in the case . . . the company says we have only so much dollars to spend and somebody has to go someway. In order to handle the NAACP suit, in order to handle the crowd that was there making the noise oppressing the human rights commission, everybody was pressing PG&E in 1971 . . .

15: I know you two have the answer but it's just not coming out so we're going to ask you one more time. If you have a cable splicer who has been on the job for 10 years and there is a policy decision by the firm that we have got to increase our minorities. What we want to know is how did they phrase, justify or rationalize? What happened to the cable splicer? Was he fired, moved down to an installer, what happened to him?

07: He was moved down the ladder because the company had X number of dollars to spend for that department and since they can't have 5 cable splicers on the same budget.

15: Okay. That's what happened to me. I was a 5-year teacher and I was tenured. I was close to making about $1300 a month. They wouldn't give me a permanent placement. Every September I had a different school. I said quite frankly, "Fuck it, I'm leaving." I'm tenured, I have a lifetime credential. They won!

15: Are you saying then that the bringing in of these additional people with a set ceiling on your department budget simply meant that something had to be watered down?

05: It's easy to argue for seniority if you're going to talk about demoting someone I don't think it's fair to demote me to hire someone else, etc.

15: When you've worked, where have you worked?

03: I worked for the San Francisco school system in office work, working with the kids with reading problems.

15: Working with the kids or with the teachers?

03: With the kids.

15: How did you get your job?

03: I was a friend of the principal, there was a special reading program, so she hired me. I was hired because they couldn't get enough of the desired minorities.

15: I'm trying to set up a hypothetical situation--if I've worked for five years you're going to replace me with a minority?

03: Yeah.

15: Playing the devil's advocate for the seniority system.

07: Okay, looking at it from the position of administrative personnel, they are generally interested in slots. Their whole world revolves around the number of slots to be filled. They don't particularly see the actual people, they see job descriptions and roles. He isn't that particularly concerned with who goes where or how many years you've been in the system, or how many back payments you've got on your car, he's only concerned with the statistics. And their argument is the most equitable form of when it comes to cuts and layoffs, has been the seniority system. Because as we mentioned in the beginning the senior member has more experience on the job, he is more productive as a worker.

05: He knows all the roles, he knows where to go so why should we move aside someone like this and cost the company money to bring in affirmative action.

03: Also more difficult for him (seniority person) to get a job.

15: . . . One of the things that is unfortunate about this whole issue, either side of it, it is so emulating that anyone can come up with anecdotes and name individuals and the opposition is giving us . . . black and white cuts, they don't care who the people are . . . We don't work in a system where caring is an efficient process which is just too bad. So make them more reliable and efficient.

05: If we make a big case for seniority, we can also make a big case for the fact that seniority has to have good qualifications, also involved. And in order to enable people to compete inspite of the seniority system, it behooves the education scene to be sure that the minorities are in fact qualified, that they are able to meet the competition inspite of the seniority get hired.

15: It's like the whole accountability thing and tenure for teachers. Is tenure some way of allowing that teacher to stay for 20 years and good teachers to go. I never will forget when I was teaching how people went to freak city just behing their accountability sheets. They were so hysterical because no one read them.

07: Yeah.

15: You had 2½ pages of mitigating factors that would get you over. All you had to do was list them. I could guarantee that my kids could read a year and a half beyond grade level by the time June came providing attendance, books, and environment.

05: Do we have 5 votes in favor of argument of seniority?

15: Lets see, like what you said about the seniority system.

07: Yeah. Equal ability because there's no way . . . people take time to learn where things are on the job--that employee is on the job 6 months before he makes money off the company. So the argument for seniority is more for efficiency.

03: Also, the general attitude of other workers is better (in a seniority system)

15: Yes it provides better morale (fewer advancements)

07: If no seniority they (people) won't buy as much.

(30 seconds?)

03: Ask questions.

07: Morale low if old Jim is bumped for minority.

15: May not (the work crew) tell the new guy the ropes.